

Ray Morose PO Box 60 Ocean Shores NSW 2483 Australia

Website: www.themindofconsciousness.com

Contact: Use contact form on the website

A Universal Moral-Ethical Code

- Incorporating –

Commission/Omission

And

Differentiating between an Aim and a Goal

At first glance it may appear as if differentiating between an aim and a goal has little to do with commission and omission. But it will be seen that identical factors are at play within both as they incorporate individual, corporate, social, global and/or environmental responsibility. That identicalness arises as every action or non-action is founded upon a moral foundation establishing a non-restricted directional aim or a restrictively defined goal. Or, if no moral foundation exists, an ethical stance is generally non-existent, opening the doors to various forms of self-destruction. It then becomes more complicated, as even a moral foundation must be examined to discover if it is experientially verified or learnt by rote, as learning by rote contains the *potential* to respond similar to having no moral foundation. Thus, there are three major positions that establish an aim or a goal that also becomes the frame of reference for an act of commission or omission.

First, if a moral foundation is created through experiential verification the resultant ethical standards will always stand-strong in the face all forms of personal and economic turmoil, creating an ethical true-face. It is an experientially derived ‘face’ that applies to that individual, and all others equally regardless of nationality, ethnicity, and political or religious affiliation.

Secondly, if a morality is learnt and maintained by rote an ethical false-face has fertile ground to grow upon. That ‘face’ arises and can become self-maintaining as the ethics of that position are enclosed within a framework that takes the moral foundation as sacrosanct (the fertile ground) without any requirement to experientially prove that position. The potentially resultant false-face is therefore restrictively brittle and as a consequence is subject to breaking under pressure. But strangely enough even though ‘brittle’ it appears to be ‘malleable’ when the holder of that position applies those ethical standards to himself or herself. Meaning a false-face, by definition, is also subject to flexible fragmenting as it is used in certain situation and not in others as it has not been experientially verified: hence, rightly referred to as a false-face. This suggests that a moral foundation learnt by rote, and later in life ignored, generally results in the ethics evolved, from that now defunct moral base, are easily being manipulated to twist in all directions to accommodate endless forms of self-interest. The false-face of that manipulation is witnessed by others as various forms of personal gain or self-aggrandizement, which is reflected in the ‘things’ that individual has or wants.

Thirdly, if no moral foundation ever existed then self-preservation literally takes pride-of-place within that individual's life and no action is reprehensible to maintain that Machiavellian position. Meaning, there are no ethical standards making it the most dangerous of all positions, as another's life has no value beyond how it can materially enhance or maintain that morally and ethically deficient individual's way-of-life. Nothing of value or good ever arises from that position, as it is perpetually and singly focused upon absolute self-interest to the detriment of everyone.

The foregoing suggests any understanding of commission, omission, aims, and goals must take into account an individual moral foundation, how it is created and maintained, and what form of ethics evolve from that structure? Otherwise any discussion simply goes in endless circles as the structure of that foundation is ignored to discuss or argue about 'things' built upon it, or extend from it. Therefore, what is a moral foundation and what are 'honest' ethics built upon that base that justify and promote its structural integrity?

The definition of a moral is generally taken as knowing the difference between right and wrong, creating the ethics of correct behavior judged appropriate or inappropriate by the standards of a reasonable and responsible citizen. But the problem arising with that definition is that what is right for one may well be wrong for another and what is correct behavior in one culture may well be offensive in another. And of course what is a reasonable or responsible citizen? Therefore, the foregoing definition of a moral relies upon some form of preexisting societal code-of-behavior, generally originating from a religious fraternity. That makes a clear definition of what a moral code and accompanying ethics difficult to discern, as it can potentially alter from society to society or religion to religion.

As a consequence of that stated difficulty it becomes imperative to create a universal moral standard that automatically, or naturally, establishes a personal ethical position regardless of the society one lives within. Without that universal moral-ethical code an act of commission/omission and an aim and a goal would be impossible to discuss as they would alter according to the various societies or religions. So the only practical solution is to establish a universal moral-ethical code not influenced by any pre-existing definitions.

To begin that reevaluation it is essential to know why a moral code is essential and what that code achieves. Basically it can be stated that any such code should provide absolute physical safety, mental security, and social justice within a supportive community. Reducing that sentence to its fundamental core would read 'living free of any form of fear'. As such it would be reprehensible to allow fear to permeate any moral structure. Accordingly, a moral code established using fear in its structure would be deemed flawed. Hence, it cannot contain fear of retribution or appeasement from any scriptural Source-of-Creation, as both are fear inducing. That enlightened vision banishes all statements that include 'do this' or 'do not do that' using fear of the Lord God as justification. Or, the flaw in using fear as a motivating force to maintain obedience is doomed to eventually fail, as using fear to banish fear is similar to using mud to remove a stain. As well, using fear as the motivating force to

establish a moral code is potentially dangerous as it is easily manipulated by unscrupulous individuals to turn that code into a weapon to do precisely what the code was established to prevent. That danger is witnessed when religious fanaticism is used to kill with the absurd belief that that killing saves. Therefore fear cannot be present within the structure of a moral code-of-behavior as fear can be manipulated or used as either a weapon to destroy or a shield to protect or justify any resultant action.

Consequently, fear in any form cannot exist within the foundation of a moral code or used to underpin an ethical position. The moment you remove fear an entirely new vision of humanity automatically appears as we recognize our human commonality and not our differences. The next time you encounter a challenging posture of another, or a personally trying decision, try removing fear from the equation and notice the different vision that removal induces. Suggesting, if you apply that vision in daily life a personal moral code arises of its own volition. Thus, any resultant ethical standard using that code as a guide will witness humankind as an extension of 'who' and 'what' you are, making any interaction connectively 'honest'. That 'honesty' is free of fear, freeing you of any prejudicial and/or judgmental mind-sets allowing a comfortable openness to exist within personal encounters. As a consequence you naturally and consistently feel connectively good about yourself. As well your new sense of mental wellbeing feels connected to an ineffable Source that feels present, but indefinable. This internal and external connectivity arises from your newly discovered subliminal *direction* felt or experienced 'equanimity-of-compassion', which is the connection to that Source. This is where nationality, ethnicity, or political or religious affiliation disappears to reveal a human connective commonality. That multiple connectivity (to your newly discovered wellbeing to the Source-of-Existence, and to humankind in general) displaces all the various forms of fear that created artificial divisions and barriers, preventing that 'honest' vision from becoming a personal reality.

Therefore, in assessing a moral code it simply becomes a matter of determining if fear, in any form, is present within its foundation. If fear is missing, in both the giver and receiver, then it can be referred to as an 'honest' moral code resulting in 'honest' ethical standards that is applied to everyone with absolute equality. On the other hand, if you discover any form of fear being used to establish a moral code that code can be regarded as inherently flawed and dismissed as an inappropriate foundation to establish ethical standards.

This means, being able to universally distinguish between a morally established right and wrong is *simply a matter of determining if any form of fear is present in its foundation*. Try the application yourself and see how it works. You may have to dig a little deeper than what is superficially obvious to discover if fear exists as it can hide behind or within a wide variety of innocently appearing elements. It is an investigative journey of discovery that opens doors you may not have realized were closed.

Applying that 'honest' moral code to a commission or omission or an aim and a goal reveals a hidden 'direction' within everyone that naturally arises with the removal of fear based on constructs and beliefs. That subliminal direction is always present but so deeply buried under our daily concerns that it

is rarely recognized as existing. But exist it does. As stated above it is experienced as equanimity-of-compassion and expressed as an open-handed and open-hearted connection to everyone you encounter. This connective experience is sometimes referred as unconditional love but that terminology may be repellent to some, and so rejected, as the terminology can be misused by those who are emotionally associated with synthetic self-righteous superiority. However, that rejection does not alter the subliminal direction impersonally embedded within every human. That direction simply requires release to alter your, or another's, life in ways that may not be fully appreciated until that release is a personal reality.

Therefore, one subheading of this little essay is appreciating the difference between an aim and a goal. A goal can be defined as 'I want that' as a 'thing' to gain and so is generally restricted. Such as I want to study medicine, I want that car, or I want to lose excess weight. An aim is normally not as narrowly constructed or less restricted as a goal. Such as a generalized aim to be supportive to those less fortunate or less privileged than you are, forming the foundation for a social conscience.

Applying those definitions to an experientially derived 'honest' moral code you will discover a goal orientation will tend to restrict or enclose it within clearly defined attributes or objectives. The outcome of applying the attributes to oneself is, in some manner, generally self-regulating. However, if the attributes are applied to others it is difficult not to become self-righteously judgmental if others do not match the standard you have applied to yourself. That resultant mind-set of that restriction indirectly defeats the 'honesty' of a moral code as fear has returned by the backdoor to insidiously destroy its foundation. As said earlier sometimes it is essential to look deep into various elements to discover if fear is hidden within them. In this circumstance it hides within 'trying to make others in your own self-regulating image'. Fear is concealed in the rejection of that 'image' as the rejection indirectly rejects the individual promoting that restrictive goal. This occurs as the 'image' and the person are effectively one and the same.

On the other hand an aim is open-ended in its application. As a consequence an aim using an experientially derived 'honest' moral code is not restricted by any form of fear. Although an aim is specific its application it is all-pervasive as its absolute openness resonates with the unrestricted directional openness of the subliminal direction impersonally embedded within consciousness. Meaning, the aim is applied to oneself but never imposed upon another, allowing your actions to do the talking for you.

The other subheading, the difference between commission and omission, is not as obvious as may be imagined as an omission can lay hidden within commission. If you see someone drowning going to their aid would appear to be a commendable act. But if that act was done with a view to some form of reward or commendation, rather than an altruistic action, it would be an omission hidden within a commission. An obvious omission is if you observe someone in desperate trouble, and have the wherewithal to prevent that trouble from eventuating, but decide to ignore that situation and walk away. Both of

those situations are moral-ethical deficiency issues, but not a legal issue and so no form of punishment results as retribution for an action only occurs for commissions that are prohibited within a society. Meaning, sometimes what appears as the best of intentions can be misguided actions. Suggesting, check beliefs and constructs that form a moral code, underpinning ethical actions, to see if they are 'honest' or have they been twisted to accommodate some form of self-interest or restrictive dogma. That can be a delicate internal investigation but if you mentally stand-aside from all forms of evaluation that rely upon a construct or belief system, the answer will arise of its own accord, which is the subliminal nature impersonally embedded within consciousness making itself known. It speaks in absolute silence and yet its 'voice' is crystal clear. You simply have to learn how to listen to that internal silence, which is learning to hear by sensing or 'feeling' that voice. That eternally silent 'voice' awakens a sense of knowing that no learning can ever achieve, nor investigation reveal. It cannot be given to another nor can you 'own' it. Enjoy this internal journey of discovery as it will awaken a new vision of existence that 'silently' guides you to not only see by sensing, or 'feeling', the subtle direction of that vision but it will also subliminally support you to personalize what is seen, sensed, or 'felt'.

You may question the meaning of this essay but if you simply observe the destructive effects of a misguided goal, a thoughtless commission, or a deliberate omission you will appreciate why it is essential to recognize, or distinguish, the difference between an 'honest' moral codes true-face and its deceptive false-face as each face determines how a society develops or self-destructs.

(No copyright on essays - Free to share)