

EVERYBODY HAS A MORALITY AND THE CHOICE IS BETWEEN THE STANDARD MORALITY AND AN EVERYTHING IS PERMITTED MORALITY

The one thing morality needs to be morality and the one thing that makes morality possible is being capable of being moral. A moral ought implies can.

Morality is the power to choose to do the right thing as in the best thing, the fairest thing, the most compassionate thing and the kindest thing. If you say there is no morality you simply replace it with another. Morality asks, "Why do this?" If you say, "Why not?" That is simply another why. You have to have a why no matter what you do. That is why being a nihilist and saying morality is wrong only leaves you with another morality.

That is all you need to know but here is more on the topic.

There are many contradictions. There is one that underpins and rules over all.

It is, "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!"

People act as if morality is real even when they deny it. It is as if they sense that argument and embody it even if they do not articulate it. Relativists are not relativists when the Nazis come to take them away!

Believers in God manage to imagine that God somehow IS and represents their moral values. As we shall see, if morality is a necessary evil then this glorification and turning it into God is a step too far. It is like having to kill somebody in self-defence and then celebrating it. The choice to have a morality is a necessary evil for it is about having a choice not if it is the right choice. It is not about right as we shall see. It is about choosing an objective morality for you have to have one. It is pragmatic.

Morality (sums up justice, mercy, compassion, respect and love etc) is objectively true. Morality is what you get if there is truth. Objective morality means that morality is not opinion but fact and truth.

If you say morality is not true then you are ending up with another morality: it is moral to say morality is not true. It is honest. It is truth. It respects truth. It loves truth. You serve others by telling them there is no morality.

So no matter what you do you cannot avoid having a morality even if it is a bad one! You are still aiming at truth and that is the bottom line. And both moralities come with a price and demand sacrifices!

Without truth love and justice and everything else would be just words.

A mathematician who says that all sums are rubbish is still making a mathematical statement. If you say that $1 + 1 = 2$ is not true or is a delusion then you are saying $1 + 1$ can be anything but 2. That is still maths. You contradict yourself. That is what the denier that morality is true is doing too.

But if you admit you are making a mathematical/moral statement the contradiction disappears. This means you have a different maths and morality from other people.

What can you say to somebody like that who says their maths is as good as yours and their morality is as good as yours and it is their choice? Actually nothing. It is private and a matter for each individual.

This tells us that morality, in either understanding, could be true but still not very useful. And even dangerous.

Persons who say it is moral to say the mores of morality are nonsense have to oppose those who differ. To live the morality one has to rebel against society. One will see it as oppressing oneself.

The person who rejects their choice and follows a standard morality has to oppose them as dangerous. For example, if saints start murdering for they have decided that the moral rule against killing is itself immoral they will have to be killed to stop them.

Either form of morality is a necessary evil. The usual morality we have is a necessary evil for it has to respect the right of a person to reject it and say it is loving to say all is permitted. The all is permitted as morally good morality is a necessary evil too for obvious reasons.

Can both be necessary evils? They are two sides of the same coin. There is no reason to choose one over the other except that you can only have one! The all is permitted one can be manifested as, "As all is permitted I will express that by going along with the standard morality. If I believe all is permitted then I can permit myself to go for the standard morality." So there is no way to tell what morality somebody has. You are not going with the standard for you think it is right but because you think the all is permitted is right.

What if the standard morality with its problems is the necessary evil for the other morality is worse? But that is assuming it is the best. There is no way to get away from the fact that logic alone or proof cannot help us. They offer a choice but leave it up to us. So both are necessary evils. A choice to kill A or B is a case of choosing between two necessary evils. If there were any difference at all then the best choice would be the necessary evil.

Look at it this way, it is about intention. Both the standard moralist and the all is permitted one intend to be moral. The results are a separate matter. It is about intending to be moral. What else can you do but live by intention?

KNOWLEDGE

You know you have to be moral but that does not tell you if you should have the standard morality or an all is permitted morality.

If you say there could be many things that are immoral or moral but you don't know which is which then what? You might say, "It is objectively immoral to claim to know that anything is moral or immoral. Apart from the fact that it is immoral, you cannot know any other moral facts."

That is as good or otherwise as saying there are no moral facts but the fact that there are none. If morality can be known then you are immoral. Plus as morality decrees that ought implies can it follows that if you can only have indications not proofs or evidence that love is good that is all the knowing you need.

It is probable that most people who oppose our moral standard are not saying there are no moral facts but one all is permitted morally. They are saying that all rules are immoral, but that there is no way of knowing more than that one.

GOD

Religion says you need to believe in God in order to realise that morality is true. Otherwise it is just something you go along with and hope is true. A revelation from God is pointless unless it teaches that this is all true and that honouring God is to honour justice and love. So there is religion saying it and "God" saying it. God is pointless if he is not about those principles.

The attempt to connect morality and God is an attempt to effectively fuse them. That attempt is violence against how you cannot avoid being a being who reasons that or who sees that morals are real. It is opening yourself up to deception and it is deception.

If God grounds objective morality then it follows that we are evil if we do not believe in God. Religion says an atheist can do good and be good but that sounds thin. If you are really good you will know justice and love in your heart instead of just acting just and loving. Otherwise you would be worse than the person who claims to be well-meaning but who thinks you can use children for leisurely target practice. You strike at the heart of morality by striking at God. To make it about actions mostly means you don't even know what morality is. Its evil in itself. The child abuse is more obviously evil but this is too.

Morality does not care that we ask why justice and love, its components, are valid and true. It is not about us though we need it. It just forces us to accept there is objective morality. That is why we struggle with it for we like to be free. We don't really like or love it. But we make the bondage worse by trying to fight it. If God grounds objective morality then we cannot truly like or love God! It is something extra to bother us. We can only pretend or make up a version of God that suits ourselves.

EXPERIENCE

We know from experience that letting people proclaim murder good because they want to believe it is not workable. So we are forced to take standard morality as real. Society gives us no choice. Even those who say morality is what they want it to be only act as if they believe it in a few things. They are still mostly the same as anybody who believes only in real morality. They cannot change very much.

CONCLUSIONS

Now you can say, "To say nothing at all is objectively moral or immoral is to contradict yourself by making a moral statement." But what if you say, "All moral rules are nonsense except the rule that it is nonsense. To say anything else is a lie"? There is no logical problem with the notion that the only thing that is objectively wrong is to lay down any other objective moral judgements. There is no contradiction if you mean there is only one moral principle: that all other moral principles are false.

A morality that says such a thing indeed would seem to be the worst thing imaginable. It would surpass everything else in what depravity it allows and permits and revels in.

It would demand that anybody who has more than one moral rule should be persecuted and that person would be seen as opposing a fact.

It would mean you would pretend to hold to the same morality as everybody else and when you get the power you can show your true beliefs and make the blood run. You may say it is a lie, and thus wrong, to say there are objective moral standards except the standard that there are no other standards.

A lot of people can be hiding the standard morality and be really servants of its alternative.

If you want to believe in objective morality you will have to avoid ending up with a self-refuting morality. A self-refuting objective morality is not an objective morality at all. It is moral subjectivism and lies masquerading as morality.

So everybody believes in objective morality. They cannot avoid it any more that they can live without air.