



---

## CHAPTER 13 | Morality

Morality, the judgment of right and wrong, is a human invention. In nature, judgment is absent. Nature and the universe are neutral. In these realms it is as it is. If you do not judge people or events, then there is room for new experiences and insights. The judgment is a fruit of our mind. Usually nourished by fear. It only keeps people imprisoned in their own safe space. Separated from the rest of the world. You promote your consciousness by facing reality in an unbiased way. Why can't it be the way it is? Nothing transforms out of resistance to reality. You have to face the facts. Nonjudgmental. Because morality is an invention of man, the question is what contribution has judging right or wrong made in the past centuries to the happiness and development of mankind? In other words, what has been the added value of a thought that says you cannot do or think something because God, society, the state or tradition think it is wrong? What is good? What is wrong? And why would something be right or wrong? Who decides that? And why is the moral code of God or the state superior to the moral code of an individual or nature? Surely the sole purpose of the individual is to create a happy and joyful life for himself? What is wrong with that? Why should this person, in that pursuit, carry the burden of the whole world on his shoulders at the same time? Why is that a good thing? What is good about people sacrificing themselves for the good of others or society? Who is society? And what has society done to make itself happy? What has society done to make the person who sacrifices himself for her happy? Why is it wrong for a person to focus solely on the realization of his own happiness? Why is that selfish? Why is selfishness bad? What is good about altruism and self-sacrifice? Altruism is the philosophical doctrine that says that everything an individual does out of commitment to the good of others is good, but that it is bad if this action is motivated by self-interest. Self-sacrifice at the expense of the individual has always been regarded by religions as one of the greatest virtues. It has been labelled as the morally right thing to do. Why is that? The answer to this question is that this morality allows the church to keep their believers in dependence and to generate income on that basis. After all, the church, but also the state, are completely dependent on what individuals are willing to give in labour, money and possessions to them. If this giving away is considered to be one of the greatest moral virtues of any human being here on earth, then success on a lasting stream of income and continuity is guaranteed. This "something-for-nothing" doctrine is the ideal of all those who parasitize the real labour efforts of others. Ayn Rand describes this as follows: *"The question is not whether we are slaves to a 'good' cause or to a 'bad' cause. The question is not dictatorship by a good gang or by a bad gang. The question is freedom or dictatorship."* Altruism and self-sacrifice, in today's society also packaged as solidarity, however, lead to hypocrisy. It is a road without a future. It is a road to death. Both doctrines teach that the interests of the individual are opposite to the interests of the group. The only right thing to do is to sacrifice that own interest for the benefit of others. This means that anything that is practical and beneficial



and contributes to an individual's personal happiness and well-being is immoral and anything that interferes with that is morally good. This obviously leads to an unsolvable contradiction. A human being can therefore never be morally right and at the same time practical and creating happiness for himself. This duality sets man against himself. He becomes his own inner enemy. This conflict can only be solved by hypocrisy. Saying one thing and doing the other in real. This is the escape to be able to function "normal" every day. Many initiatives around new themes such as environmental climate and sustainability bear witness to this. These themes have been moralized. This leads to individuals, companies and institutions all pretending to be very busy with these issues. At the level of society, morality is nothing more than one of the most subtle forms of manipulation of human behaviour. The ruling elite, the church, and all kinds of social initiatives that are concerned with the welfare of man and the world, derive their right to exist from altruism and self-sacrifice. Or to quote Ayn Rand: *"Socialism is the doctrine that man has no right to live for himself, that his life and his work do not belong to him but to society, that his service to society is the only justification for his existence, and that society may dispose of him in any way it wishes for the benefit of what one sees as one's own tribal, collective interest. There is no difference between communism and socialism, except in the means to achieve the same final result: communism wants to enslave people through violence, socialism through the voting booth. It's just the difference between murder and suicide."* In the process of personal awareness, this form of morality does not bring you anything. Seen from our human nature, there is only one morality. Life is given to man to make the best of it by striving for personal happiness and prosperity and to reap its full benefits. Only if you act on the basis of your head and your heart, you're able to create a happy and emotionally satisfying life. This means that everything that promotes that life is good, and everything that damages or destroys that pursuit is wrong. Someone who lives for their own sake does not sacrifice themselves and does not ask others to sacrifice themselves for them. There is no conflict of interest between people who live on the basis of this morality. After all, it is not in the interest of all parties to sacrifice themselves for the other. This is the only objective moral standard for human life. Why? Because otherwise it will eventually lead to the end of all human life on Earth. After all, everyone sacrificed themselves for another. This universal and life respecting morality, should not prevent anyone from giving something back to society on the basis of their own motives. The difference is that this is done on a voluntary basis and not on social coercion.