

It is Called Morality

This article has been written for the Faithchaser's Network

The English language defines morality as:

Morality (mə'raliti)

Grammatical: noun; plural: moralities

Meaning: principles concerning the distinction between right and wrong or good and bad behaviour; a particular system of values and principles of conduct.

Synonyms: ethics, rights and wrongs, correctness, ethicality.

Etymology: The word is taken directly from Latin moralis "proper behavior of a person in society," literally "pertaining to manners," coined by Cicero ("De Fato," II.i) to translate Greek ethikos (see ethics) from Latin mos (genitive moris) "one's disposition," in plural, "mores, customs, manners, morals," a word of uncertain origin.

Modern usage: Whilst the words "Morals" and "Ethics" were interchangeable in earlier times, modern day usage tends to assign "ethics" into a professional category or dealing with commerce and those that reflect the integrity of that endeavour, whereas morality is taken to be a measure of an individual or group of individuals, e.g. a morally bankrupt society, unethical practises of medical professionals, the unethical nature of big banks in the 21st century.

The subject of morality is not a stranger to articles and treatise' being written about it by philosophers and social commentators who have been engaging in its mysteries for millenniums. Contributors to this subject refer back to the Abrahamic Period for examples of morality emanating from a structured behaviour, however we can extend back even further into the reaches of the beginnings of modern man and the song lines that come from the period circa 4,000 BC where the roots of our modern day societal structures had their genesis.

The professional community has been prolific in its discussion on the subject of codifying groupings of human behaviours and analysing human principles that seem to under-gird them. As is pretty typical of human behaviour itself, the combined involvement of professional, academic and novice commentators on the subject of morality and its underlying psychological structures has finely shredded the research of it into an almost nonsensical haze of triple stapled meaning. And so then, the question begs, why would I enter into this forest of dense undergrowth and towering hardwoods when it is obvious that I do not belong in this dark over-bearing place.

Well it is by no coincidence that I trail behind the rush of those before me who pen eloquent expression over this somewhat esoteric system of judgement and

deliberate on their psychological observations about its outworking in their human studies. However, that being said, why am I here? (Ho hum to the philosophical deliberation on that one)

There is one truism about this subject that clearly everyone will agree, well almost everyone, and it is that morality is a multiplex structure of human mind sets that intra-act with the human decision making process and more than likely determines how we physically and mentally respond to given scenarios that out play before us. And no one is immune here – because all reactionary responses, including none, are a facet of this intriguing family of electrical pulses across the intra-cranial universe of our neurons.

A literature search on the subject is challenging to follow, and as an example if we search the internet for this word the search engine registers ninety-five and a half million references to it. The sheer volume of this work produces an innumerable number of convoluted ideas and postulations echoing from ancient times down thousands of years to Twenty-First Century life as we have it today. We can de-jargonise the discussion to a common sense level and understand that whatever this thing is that we refer to as “morals”, can be influenced by a large number of external and internal factors, and even more complicating is that these factors can be concurrent at any given time and hence the interactions of the individual influences may themselves interact to produce erroneous behavioural out-workings that bare little relationship to the originating inputs.

It makes little sense to take this time to replicate the work of others in defining in excruciating detail the idiosyncratic behaviours of individuals whom we may cite as either having a disposition of being good, bad, right, wrong or evil.

However, and I do mean, however, if we fail to build a solid foundation upon which our judgement of morality in either its base form or even its contemporary form can be compared we are just flying colourful kites in the wind with nothing more than a guess as to what wind is subjugating it. Like wind, whose outworking is the invisible hand of the planet’s dynamic forces, the outworking that determines a person’s morality is just as unpredictable – even where there exists strong air flow over the lift-wings and one would think that directional predictability was reasonably certain.

And then, (how’s that for starting a new paragraph with a conjunction?) how should other human individuals express opinions on any person when they, themselves, are also maintaining a rear guard action in a foray of what they deem to be right, wrong, good, bad and evil in the world. How can humans make any meaningful judgments on morality when it is a very transient phenomenon purely dependant on their world around about whilst they are in

their own particular space-time place? There is of course an answer to this and to be able to grasp it we need to recognise, and take into account, the fundamental foundation from which every human being that has ever existed was equipped with for their life's travail. Morality is not it! Morality is merely an attempt to group certain behaviours that align to common principles that appear to co-existence in our human psyche.

It is a bit like the chicken and the egg conundrum – but we now know that the species of fowl appeared on Earth somewhere in the Phanerozoic Eon and contrary to the précised view that they came from dinosaurs, in fact the DNA of fowl was a branch from marine life out of the earth's waters¹. Hence the chicken egg takes its form from, for want of a simple description, fish eggs, and therefore our answer to the conundrum is – the egg came before the chicken. And so in similar circumstances morality and behaviours do not follow as one might otherwise think - one being a confined sub-grouping by the other. Moreover, it comfortably fits that our distinction of morality types is only our humanist description of observed human behaviour and therefore there are no psychological pre-sets in our person to which we refer to as a standard morality. Human life without influence is not that complicated; it is the influences that determine consistencies of behaviour types.

Take an archetype of an immoral character.

Dictionary meaning of “immoral”

ɪˈmɒr(ə)l

Grammar: adjective

Meaning: not conforming to accepted standards of morality. "Unseemly and immoral behaviour"

Synonyms: unethical, bad, morally wrong, wrongful, wicked, evil, unprincipled, unscrupulous, dishonourable, dishonest, unconscionable, iniquitous, disreputable, fraudulent, corrupt, depraved, vile, villainous, nefarious, base, unfair, underhand, devious; sinful, impure, unchaste, unvirtuous, shameless, degenerate, debauched, abandoned, dissolute, reprobate, perverted, indecent, lewd, licentious, wanton, bawdy, lustful, promiscuous, whorish; informalshady, low-down; informaldodgy, crooked, not cricket; archaicmiscreant

"they deplored immoral behaviour among the upper classes"

If a character had to be demonstrably everything above in order to be declared immoral, then I would strongly suggest that their number would be very few and far between. But what happens when humans are only demonstrating one

¹ Genesis 1:20

or two of these behaviours? Are they immoral? Are they only partly immoral – and if so what proportion of them is moral? Is adultery immoral? Is stealing from children immoral? But if that thief is penniless and struggling to put food on the table for family, does this mitigate that immorality. Is stealing from a rich person immoral – or just a petty crime? Does this lead to us having to separate the person from the act? ie, a person maybe a good law-abiding soul whose philanthropic gifts to the community are very generous, but does the act of a sixty year old man marrying an eighteen year teenager be considered as immoral in general society.

We have a very classic example here involving Australia when at a deep crisis point in England; thousands of their community's non-gentry class were literally starving to death. Was it immoral for them to steal a loaf of bread? Then again, was the judiciary immoral for tearing away husbands and wives from their families and shipping these wretched people into another world where they suffered extremes of deprivation and very high mortality on an island on the other side of the world – all over a handful of flour and some dairy fat? And as you can see we could fill a very large book with an endless number of examples that in isolation maybe immoral, but in a complexity of other influences are not so straight forward. Hence with no control point or foundation with which we can measure the morality of human behaviour, we are feeling our way through very murky water.

Is the introduction of law a way to measure and control morality? Yes, but only to a certain extent, and to progress this discussion I wish to go back to our beginnings. Now we don't know for sure what the pre-marriage courtship looked like at the time of Hominin Man, say circa 100,000 BC, but the popular thought gives us a base to start from. This was hunter-gatherer caveman territory where the subsistence regime was hand-to-mouth feeding and the predominant living quarters were caves and natural enclosures. Tools mainly consisted of items that could deliver blunt force trauma and sharp flesh-penetrating spears. Clothing was of unrefined animal skins and depending on climate possibly broad-leaf plant foliage. It is held that this genus of man had thick fur-like hair as a body covering – either in part or wholly. There were no laws, and there is no evidence of large community groups co-existing together.

So to our scenario about courtship, the popular thought is that when Hominin males found suitable females of the specie, they clubbed them into submission and dragged them back to the male's lair where, in time, they produced a family. The question arises, was this immoral or not? Certainly the male did not think so. What about the rest of his society – parents, siblings, cousins etc? Well apparently not either, because we promulgate this story of ancient human activity as though it actually happened. Now ask the same question if this

occurred tomorrow at Federation Square in down town Melbourne, Australia. Do I need to answer this?

Hominin man had no law other than the right of might. I am bigger and more powerful therefore I will do this. This was his personal point of view, and collectively it was the view of acceptable societal behaviour. Hence to them – it was not immoral - it was accepted practise. We may even make a case for the bludgeoning death of wildlife in front of young children in the day, but again, Hominin Man did what he did. It wasn't moral or immoral – it just was their behaviour. Are we to then determine that morality is linked to other psychological phenomenon, for instance IQ, education, even being compressed into living in close proximity to others? We might surmise perhaps all three.

We can glimpse quite a lot from what archaeology are reporting about ancient man. For a long period leading up to circa 4,000 BC they were, as a genus, in decline and notably did not progress beyond their stone-age status over the hundreds of thousands of years of their existence. They remained static in mental development and did not possess the necessary brain power to escape their profound primitivism. Can we therefore even contemplate moralizing over their life style and behaviours? I would strongly contend that the answer to this was firmly no!

Come up in history to circa 4,000 BC. Something changed the world through a quantum leap; the likes of a mega shift in human development to what mankind has not witnessed since. Let's talk about the advent of Adam and Eve on planet Earth.

Now immediately I can foresee hackles rising and every dissenting individual's universe of intra-cranial neurons being engulfed in judgemental indignation that deplores any interventionism from the notion of a single supreme deity – and moreso in relation to the one who describes himself as “I am who I am”, “there are no others before me” and “I am the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob”².

Well, let me be as unambiguous as it is possible to be. No one will ever understand the nature of the human phenomenon of morality unless they grasp who God is, what God's position is in relation to our world, and what His plan is for humankind into the unforeseeable future. Discussion about this whole subject matter is a flatulence of mere left-over gases ejecting from a vacant shell unless that shell is filled and occupied by that which brings to birth and has ultimate rule over a rejuvenated inner man – the man of God having a structured conscience and moral consistency. Unless we go back to the roots of why

² Ibrahim, Yitschak and Yaakov

mankind has a capacity to identify “moralis” as a psychological collective noun for behavioural patterns that otherwise might be described as we would for animals, ie good dog, bad dog, sooky dog.

The good news is that God has given us a base from which all human activity can be judged to be moral or not. But if we do not accept God as the creator of our world for the sole purpose of Him raising up spiritual mankind through a process of redemption by activating the mechanism of salvation in us, then we are just empty shells. Human life forms are born dead in the spirit. They mature and get on with living in the world as a day-to-day function of being alive, but unless they have an interaction with God, at His instigation, and go on to become complete with spiritual inner man, their life ceases when they die as do soap suds down the gully trap – all froth and bubble but decidedly void of substance.

It is that new spiritual life within that gives substance to our physical bodies and provides the strong influence over our thought processes and behaviours, and because the spiritual regeneration has its genesis from a single common point, God, it is universally the same and hence has commonalities in how regenerated human life forms think and behave. This is where we see the base line and the scale of what we may deem to be moral and immoral.

The advent of Adam and Eve upon Earth was at a time when Hominin Man roamed the planet still locked into his Stone-Age lifestyle having been trapped and caged by his lack of brain power to generate meaningful change. The archaeological professions tell us that Hominin man lacked the bony infrastructure in the throat to be able to produce articulate sounds and their brain capacity was decidedly smaller than modern mankind as we are today, and therefore even this version of early man could not engage in articulate communication. They left very little fossil evidence of their existential footprint and it is held that their life was toward the extreme of primitivism. Further, agronomists tell us that pre Adam and Eve there were no broad acre cropping for food which would have been largely driven by uniform climatic conditions on the planet that lacked the temperature differentiations we have today between the polar regions and the tropical equatorial band. Further, they left no evidences of structured learning or passages of recorded history or memory, and from a deity point of view there has been no evidence of any such adoration or servitude.

Putting all of this together, Hominin Man was a living carcass and had not the physiological engineering to go any further. We cannot moralise over this early form of man in respect of what we have discussed about his lifestyle or

behaviours and for these and many other reasons, God chose to bring Hominin Man to a natural end of his era.

The biblical account of Genesis is a very worthwhile and intensely interesting document. Recent studies found that contrary to commonly held suggestions about its authorship (including being fictional) that Genesis is made up of ancient song-lines going right back to the actual period of time Adam and Eve walked in the region of the now Middle East. What occurred in the formative period of their maturity was the introduction of law that would go on to undergird all future civilisations throughout the world. Remember that all through the period of Hominin Man and those genuses beforehand, the concept of a codification of behaviours was unconceived.

What that law was that God imposed upon Adam and Eve on the surface is not so relevant, what was relevant though was that they disobeyed and consequently paid a very high price. That high price impacted mankind right down to today and I have always held that if Adam had known what those consequences were he would not have been so inclined to be disobedient.

The anthropogeny of mankind from that point is very intelligently and succinctly laid down in song-lines recorded in Genesis and trace through the millenniums the exceptional development of human upskilling. It was only a mere thousand years for the Iron Ages and the metal minerals Ages occurrences to signal the world's advancement in technologies which would drive mankind into unforeseeable heights of advancement and ultimately fuel the world toward today's tragic intergalactic dreams.

Through this process we see God take the remnant relatives of Adam and Eve and mould them into what the world would become to know as Israel, and through that lineage group establish the first codification of a complex set of laws that set out a writ of "wrongs" referred to in its early form as The Ten Commandments and later the six hundred and thirteen Mosaic laws.

These laws were a code of behaviour that were imposed upon the Children of Israel dealing with their servitude toward God himself, acceptable standards of conduct for community living, rules in relation to sacrificed offerings dealing with health, disobedience to the laws and also dietary regulations. So here we see a guarantee (or even a Bill of Rights) that can be extracted from the laws to show the Hebrew tribes what was acceptable to God – and in turn what was acceptable conduct within this general community. And if we wish to grasp the concept of morality as a form of acceptable societal norms of behaviour, this is where we should look.

From these biblical accounts it becomes apparent that mankind is not born with a virtuous set of moral standards and there is quite some discussion we could have here. And why I say this is because if we look at the events throughout the period of Israel's autonomy they were very recidivist in breaking these laws to the point of God relinquished his hand upon them as "the apple of his eye". In plain speak he allowed judgment to be dealt upon them and they were physically disbursed as a nation into the Northern and European regions. And this is important to follow through because it did not come "naturally" to live in a moralistic way within their system of societal law.

Most of us know the broad detail of Israel's rise and fall throughout the ages. We are aware that the introduction of law to mankind was to identify what was acceptable behaviour to God and it became relevant in regard to following a rigid pathway that needs to be followed if salvation is to be the instrument of God's redemption of mankind to an everlasting eternity. God knew before time what events would occur in Israel's upbringing but even though for Israel it was a very tough road to walk for those thousands of years, it was necessary as a teaching aid for mankind to know that there was within the human makeup a very troublesome influence that is referred to as the power of Sin. This is perhaps the Shangri La psychoanalysts have been thinking was a natural occurring morality. It is not, in fact it is the opposite and quite comfortably we could coin it a natural occurring immorality.

Without God introducing mankind to divine law, the naturally occurring power of Sin within us would not have been evident, and for those with a flair for detail, this power of Sin over mankind only came about as a direct consequence of Adam and Eve's disobedience toward God. But there is more to all of this.

God intended that the prescribed Law of Moses (as it is referred to) was not the be-all and end-all of the mechanism to open up the pathway of redemption back to God. He knew that as the First Adam came into a world of primitive Hominin Man and jump-started humanity on its journey towards redemption back to God that there would be a need for a second Adam, or as Jesus is referred to in scripture, the last Adam.³ We also see from this scripture passage that the first Adam from Eden was made a living soul. This is what differentiated both he and Eve from the population of Hominin Man around them. And so it goes, the last Adam was made a quickening spirit, and this is what differentiates Jesus Christ, the only begotten son of God, from all those around him at the time of his advent upon the Earth. Jesus is the Messiah because he brought to mankind the holy spirit of God that would indwell

³ 1 Corinthians 15:45 And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit.

mankind as part of the mechanism toward attaining salvation into the living kingdom of God.

Many will ask the question, just who is Jesus Christ? Sure he is the only begotten son of God, and sure his name in the Hebrew language means saviour (or he who saves) but who is he in relation to the world? Well if you recall the judgement of Satan over his deception of Eve in the Garden near Eden, God said, “*And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.*”⁴ The identity of Jesus is revealed thru this judgement as being Eve’s seed. From the old language, scholars agree that the Seed of Eve is a singular personal entity and hence, Jesus is directly related to the First Adam, and was himself the Last Adam.

There is a direct mitochondrial link from Eve through her daughters all the way down through history to Mary, called Miryam in her local Hebrew family. And hence Mary brings forth the Seed of Eve, sinless and of divine parenting through the covering of the Holy Spirit. Additionally, Jesus lineage is of the Tribe of Judah and his both earthly parents have traceable linkages in the Hebrew scripts back to King David upon whom God established an everlasting kingdom and throne. Hence, as was reported at the time of his crucifixion, Jesus, the son of Joseph and Mary of the tribe of Judah was the rightful King of Israel.

But Jesus brought mankind so much more. That indwelling Holy Spirit was the vehicle through which God could fulfil his prophecy to take the imposed Law of Moses out of legislature and write it upon the hearts of those of the House of Israel.⁵ So the man of God is retro fitted with a natural power to obey the law of God, and when this occurs we can say with a surety that morality is within – and this, is the Shangri La that is so evasive for psychoanalysts to discover.

⁴ Genesis 3:15 And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.

⁵ Jeremiah 31:33, But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the LORD, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people.

Hebrews 8:10, For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people:

Hebrews 10:15 - 18, Whereof the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us: for after that he had said before, This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them; And their sins and iniquities will I remember no more. Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin.

We spoke about Jesus the Messiah as being the last Adam and that he brought (and bought) much more to mankind. He was a rabbi, a teacher and a master whose teachings even today have not been fully realised. Many might say, where is the wisdom of this great bard of society? Well apart from the indignation of being described as such, there are two lessons that are very important to our discussion. We were referring earlier to having a standard measure for determining morality, and we saw that any attempt at doing this would be fraught because we can only judge the morality of another by our own moral sense.

But what the Lord teaches about this is very profound. Here are two scripture lessons that give us a framework from which we can identify human behaviour in terms of its moral buoyancy, or “the moral high road” if you like. We can look at an action or mind-set and apply the test: Is this what I would want someone to do to me, and secondly, does this exemplify the respect, care and love toward another as I would respect, care and love myself.

1(a) Matthew 7:12

Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets.

1(b) Luke 6:31

And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise.

2(a) James 2:8

If ye fulfil the royal law according to the scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, ye do well:

2(b) Galations 5:14

For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this; Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.

These two principles are the epitome of a Christian’s approach to moral behaviour. This is the standard that can be applied to all behaviours. These principles are not exclusive to Christians and can be taken sideways to all of mankind. Indeed other creeds have similar pillars supporting their disciplines, but theirs is not a pathway to redemption by the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.

Of course there are objections that could be discussed here. Mental health issues are very prevalent in today's society and often reflect a tortured soul who would not comprehend what these principles seek to identify. But the law of the land caters for these souls. The tidal flow of general society also compounds issues with moral standards, and today we are being muscled into lowering our moral base to broaden our acceptance of practises that God has shown to be below the acceptable line for any inclusion in His kingdom.

Christians are therefore confronted with a "divine" law on one hand and a moral test on the other. So should Christians impose God's divine laws for living within the Kingdom of God onto the unregenerate general society? Or are the unsaved to be left to their own devices whilst they walk down their own pathway to destruction unable to sort out what is moral or what is immoral.

And so the battle rages on. The children of God reach their hand out to those not in God's kingdom in the hope that a soul out there has been inspired by God to search for salvation.

John 6:44 *No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day.*

Geoff Rooke