

## PARADOX - IF WE ARE FORCED TO TREAT MORALITY AS OBJECTIVE THEN WE SHOULD NOT BE

Morality, right and wrong, justice and love, those things are either opinions or truths. Calling morality objective means you consider it true. It really is true that it is right to be respectful and wrong say to be disrespectful.

Religion says that only if there is a God are there objective standards of right and wrong. That is to say that if there is no God, then we only call things right and wrong because we like and dislike them. Then, it is argued, morality is subjective or based on feelings and notions. Nothing then is really right and wrong.

But we want to mean more than liking when we say something is right. We cannot avoid wanting that. That is a reason why morality involves force. There is something forceful about morality being true. Anybody who rebels against that ends up with another forceful morality. Those who say morality is opinion say you are forced when you understand morality to understand it as opinion.

Those who say there is no objective morality at all contradict themselves and are saying it is really or objectively moral to deny morality is real. So nobody can avoid having what they treat as and intend to be an objective morality even if it is the wrong one. We are forced to have an objective morality.

### FREE WILL

Religion says that God gave us the gift of free will so that we can choose him and choose to love. Some argue that if there is no God or free will there is no morality because we are just a collection of objects. But even if we were it could still be that morality exists. In a universe where there are no living beings it is still wrong to kill a person. A person doesn't have to exist for that to be wrong. This shows us exactly how far morality and truth go in terms of being forceful and not caring what we think or want to be true. And we don't really see ourselves as objects. We think its wrong to torment even flies to death. The argument is based on lies and blackmail. It does not fit how even atheists see people.

Is objective morality based on free will alone? Or on God alone? Or both? It is believed only a free agent, such as a human being, can be moral or immoral. An animal that kills is only doing what it is programmed to do so you cannot punish it. If free will enables you to be moral or immoral then why is morality about compulsion in the sense that to reject a moral rule is to put another one - possibly a wrong one - in its place? That is not much of a free will!

Ironically, if nobody or nothing ever had free will or ever will it would still be true that a free agent has to be loving or good or just. So free will does not create morality. You can have morality without free will. But it will not apply to you unless you have free will. So morality is true even if there is no free will! It is impossible then for it to depend on God either. Surely in a sense God is pointless if there is no free will or it if it is not important enough! So if morality is independent of anybody even God having free will it is self-dependent.

If free will is given by God so that you can be moral or immoral then why is morality about compulsion? That is not much of a free will and to blame it on God is just insulting God if he exists.

You are forced to treat morality as real no matter you do. That is the non-choice you have. You do not have much of a free will at all. You would think the more choices the more free you are.

### THE CONTRADICTIONS

Some say there is nothing at all literally that is objectively moral. That is contradicting yourself. You are saying it is a lie and wrong to say objective morality is non-existent. So you are saying objective morality does exist.

Morality can be factual but something being true does not mean we have any way to know it. Some say that there is no way of knowing if anything is objectively moral. Then you are saying you know - not that there is no objective morality - but that nobody can know. That is a self-contradiction for who are you to say that nobody else knows it or can know? If you know nobody can know you may as well say you know what objective morality is. In your life you will be the same as a person who simply denies objective morality exists.

The alternatives to belief in objective morality is that morality is rubbish or that morality is relative. The moral relativist says that what is morally right for me is right for me and that if you have a different idea of what is right for you then that is okay. In other words, no moral principle is true for everyone. But that is stating a moral principle! And nobody says that if you feel you can kill your baby on a whim and that is good that you should be allowed to. Relativists are hypocrites and

never consistent. They force moral license and fear on people.

## TRUTH

Morality is no good if truth does not matter. Even if morality is fact-based it does not follow that moral people want it because it is true. They might all want it for something else. Power. Truth enforces and you cannot escape it. If morality is about saying there is truth and talk about truth is really a way to try and get power then those who say it is true that there is no truth are doing the same thing. You would rather be forced by a believer in truth than one who believes there is no truth! There is no evidence that anybody really wants morality for its own sake. Even if they do you cannot think that very many do! The pope and Jesuses of this world have only ever wanted one thing - to use truth to use you. It strokes their egos.

## OBJECTIVE GOOD

Good and moral good are different. It is good for a criminal to stay forever on a holiday but it is not morally good. What about the victims? If there were nothing it would be good that there is nobody around to suffer. Objective good is forced on us. Objective morality proceeds from and depends on objective good so it is necessarily forced on us too. Without objective good there can be no objective moral good.

Forced objective good is not our good. We are its victims, its willing victims but still victims. If it being so basic does that to us then morality which is less basic than it is victimising us far more.

## WHAT IF OBJECTIVE MORALITY IS PROGRAMMED INTO US?

It could be that the need to believe in objective morality or objective good is programmed into us. It would not be real morality if you define morality as doing what you have the power to do or not to do. Philosophers say you need to do what is right freely for if you are programmed you are no more moral than a clock. But even if what is programmed into you is not objectively moral it could be about objective goodness. In practice, it would be as good.

It is argued, "Even if objective morality is programmed into us it is part of our nature and thus even if it is an illusion it is still objectively wrong to try and get people to defy or dismiss this aspect to their nature. It harms us to oppose the aspect." If so then it is wrong to say it is programmed in even if it is true. And relativists and those who think free will is rubbish are the enemy. It is not wrong at all. Why? We cannot get rid of the programming so it does not matter if we know that it is just programming or not. We should know for we may as well and information and correct information are good for their own sake. We don't need God and religion and other ideas that demand we deny we are programmed. They are just symptoms of that form of bigotry called dogmatism. An act is objectively good even if programmed. The need to believe in objectively good acts is what would matter. The idea that we have a need to believe in objective morality is nonsense. The difference is that with the first, objective good, there is nothing that need force you to judge and maybe hate those who do bad. But morality is about punishment and risks causing hate. It goes with freewill an idea which provokes fear for it implies a person can turn evil in seconds and fear evokes hate.

What if objective morality is not real and we are programmed as if it is. What if it is real and does not apply for we are programmed? Some say it is still necessary for us to think and act as if it were true. Is it a useful fiction? A philosophy that says belief in objective morality though wrong is still necessary opens the door to abusing sinners in the name of justice is a bad philosophy. It is an abuse in itself for there is no need for it. Creating the sea for hate to swim in means you cannot say, "I oppose hate" and expect that to be enough to get you off the hook even if you say it in all sincerity.

## THE COMPULSION FROM LOGIC

If you say morality is nonsense or not real objectively, then you are saying that it is objectively immoral to say that morality is real. That is incoherent. It is swapping one morality for another. You are saying that there is no objective morality and then you say that it is objectively evil and deceitful to say there is. You cannot get away from principles. If you say there are no principles you are saying there is in fact a principle that there are no principles. That may make no sense but at least you are still saying principle is needed and that you have a principle. If there are no standards that is to say standards are to be abandoned but that becomes a standard! Law exists by default - it is self-existent.

Suppose it is not objectively good to feed a baby or kill it, then it is the law that morality is nonsense. The moral law is that morality as in detail like that is useless rubbish. It becomes evil to say that feeding or killing it is objectively wrong. Christians assert that even God cannot create such a law. That shows that God is really not about being God to them but about being their weapon. Christians believe that he somehow is their moral law but he did not make it.

Anyway no matter what you do you are aiming for an objective morality. God need not come into it and a God that is not needed is not a God at all. We are logically forced to accept and comply with moral standards.

Each system of morality forces you as a whole. Each individual principle in it forces you too. You are forced to have some kind of moral code. If one rule in that code is taken on its own you are forced to do it too for it is part of the whole. A moral code is like a worldview – remove a rule and the whole thing is threatened and should unravel. And a rule forces you in itself. For example, “Respect others”, means, “Respect Ruth.” If you don’t you respect disrespect. See the point?

## MORAL CODES AS BULLIES AND ENFORCERS

If objective morality is untrue then it is a lie to say it is true. To say it is a lie is to say morality is real. The element of force is a worry for all who promote and embrace objective morality. If you are forced to agree with love you are forced to love a different and very destructive way if you won’t agree. You are threatened. And even without the threatening you are forced. So there are two enforcements: the principle itself will come out. The principle will come out in a way you definitely do not want and which will hurt you. Morality has a bullying tone. It gives its adherents a spirit of intolerance. It tells them that intolerance is a necessary and unavoidable evil. We know that objective morality bullies in several ways. People who endorse relativism sense the bullying tone and fight it with relativism. But relativism is not the answer. It behaves the same way as objective morality so it is not the answer.

SO?

Morality is a sum-up of rights-justice, love and responsibility. What is morally right/wrong cannot be changed by anybody. It is just right or wrong and that is all there is to be said. So morality is forced on us. It is a reality that we have to line up with for it is bigger than us and does not care about what we want or think. The question, "Why justice and love? Why care about responsibility? Why do these things matter?" The WHY of morality does not matter when we are forced. The why implies thinking we are not forced or wishing we are not forced. The why shouldn’t matter. It does not change the fact that if you discard morality as fact you end up with another one that is acting like fact too.

Morality has nothing to do with a loving God for such a God wants us to be about the moral why and that is not possible. There can be no personal relationship and those who think they have one with God need to see that they are not.

Some people may be moral and be our moral guardians not for the sake of being moral but because they are attracted by how it is forced on us. You can appear to be very loving and good and devoted in advancing those values while in fact you are using love because it is force. It is the force not the love you really care about. They may use God to bait you and reinforce that seduction.

People want to find out that because love and compassion and so on exist that this shows we ought to do them. This is the mistake of thinking is can get you to a moral ought. We must remember it goes the other way to - love and compassion and so on exist but that does not mean we ought not to do them either. It just gives you choice. Take love, "Ought I love?" and "Ought I love not?" If love exists that has nothing to do with showing I should love. Some say it does not matter for life goes on. We just stick a should on and that is that and we do without showing is means ought or can do. This is an argument for pragmatism. Pragmatism is another thing forced on us in the sense that we cannot get an ought then we still have to act and are forced to act on being pragmatic.

CONCLUSION: Objective morality is like reason. When we say we don't use reason or use moral facts and don't say that things like justice are really true we are fooling ourselves. We are using reason yes for we are forced to. If we resist we use reason in a twisted way. We are using morality for we are forced to. If we resist then we use morality in a twisted way but it is still a morality. In other words, trying to resist means we proclaim the wrong things rational and the wrong things to be objectively morally good. Thus to resist is just a form of self-abuse even if you don't know it. It will impact on others too. The forcing does not care if our morality is the real thing or twisted - which is another reason why it should be considered an oppressive force. It is not sacred. It is not God. It is not from God. If it is then God should be spat on.

If your morality is objectively true, then it is true no matter what you think about it It is not about you which is why the person who says the only morality is, "All is good and permitted" might be right! Apples feed us no less though they are not about us at all. We need them. Morality then is not about God either. God based morality is an abuse.