

NATURAL MORAL LAWS IN BROOKLYN AND EVERYWHERE ELSE

ZULFIKAR MOINUDDIN AHMED

Moral boundaries are often hidden in the modern world. There are many levels of rituals and norms that try to keep people far away from crossing the boundaries of men that are up close and personal. These often are only visible to close family or in situations of great stress.

Professional white collar folks generally keep far away from other people's boundaries. In Soap Operas you can have one man fucking the wife of a colleague in dangerously close encounters. In real life this is not remotely likely because the damage to the careers would be devastating not to mention the likelihood of someone blowing away the other with a shotgun.

I went to high school from 13 in New York and I picked up the natural moral boundaries of men quite quickly. Consider this:

WHAT THE FUCK! DID I RAPE YOUR DAUGHTER?!! DID I KILL YOUR GRANMA? WHY WOULD YOU DO SUCH A THING TO ME? I DON'T EVEN KNOW YOU AND YOU FUCK ME OVER LIKE THAT? I GREW UP IN NEW YORK MOTHER FUCKER WE DON'T LIKE THAT WHEN PEOPLE WE DID NOT FUCK WITH DO SUCH THINGS. WE HATE THAT DO YOU GROCK ME MOFO? YOU THINK YOU'LL GET AWAY FOR THIS SHIT?

This is Brooklyn language, even though I went to high school in Queens. It's the norm there, and one of the exceptional things in New York is that people are expressive and loud, something that is necessary because pent up and repressed emotions are much more likely to be expressed with gun violence and murders. New York has adapted to loudness and openness about this with a smattering of cursing to liven up the communication. This actually allows for less violence, believe it or not, because people are much more open about their boundaries.

These boundaries are naturally tied to moral values; they represent a sort of street justice. In mafia movies of Sopranos and Godfather and Scarface you see the particular Sicilian strain but these are part of Brooklyn for all ethnicities, black, white, Hispanic. They are raw in a sense but the language is familiar and you will find the same laws develop in Paris or Rio de Janeiro or Buenos Aires, or Belfast or New Delhi or Beijing. The lingo will be a different, but the rules are similar of harm and retaliation. These are natural, and not based on laws on the books.

Now let me conjecture that the modern world is poorer for not having highly developed *global* notions of Virtue, and that's not just because Kant and Bentham disrupted it; there were other reasons. Virtues found their greatest flowering in Aristocracy and they had not sustained in France and elsewhere. Laws on books then became detached from natural morals in various ways and the understanding of Virtues suffered. But they are important, Virtues, because these were natural

adaptations of human understanding of our own genetic heritage. Our genetic heritage in terms of our natural instincts, natures and their behaviour was previously recorded exquisitely in mythology and maxims and proverbs and the rationalistic approaches of course were too *coarse* to fathom them but there was success with morals-in-laws. Virtues are necessary for a flourishing civilisation and for life satisfaction for individuals nonetheless, and that is the great mess of confusion today regarding morals and human nature and so on.

Bill Gates and his 'racial supremacy' ideas are dead in the water. Bill Gates himself should be totally wiped out for his horrible transgressions against me anyway. But it is interesting to see how long it takes the morons in Washington to figure that out.

1. THE GREAT ERROR OF PLATO, ARISTOTLE, KANT, BENTHAM AND WESTERN PHILOSOPHERS

Western Philosophers since Socrates have consistently made one truly fundamental error, and that is to assume that moral judgment and virtuous behaviour is a result of rationality. From the time of Socrates, there has been this great assumption that moral nature of man is primarily *rational*. This is strongly false. Moral nature of man is not rational. Rationality plays a tiny role in the moral nature of man. This is a strong error of Western Philosophy, and one that is our task to fix once and for all. At the level of individual we know from the Haidt-Greene Intuitionist model that individual moral judgment is not based on rational calculations.

This is one of the deepest problems not just for individual action and life, but for understanding how human civilisation can flourish across the globe.

2. WHAT IS A MORAL OUGHT

In our entire six million years, we humans never actually found the perfect laws of morality. We have confident Holy Scriptures and mythologies and they are *important* and *amazing* and *beautiful* but they are the hope and prayer of Man left to himself without any actual Divine Being telling him how things are. Man invented Divine Beings because Man *desperately needed certainty* and *desperately needed Divine God to be there when nothing made sense* and this hope led to confidence in some Moral oughts. Unfortunately Man is *still without the perfect answers* and is *still left with no one but himself to rely on* for these answers.

Moral Ought is a hope that some things have been discovered by our ancestors over the past, and the wisdom is good enough to produce a good outcome in a good society and a happy fulfilling life for all people or at least all good people. That's a Moral Ought. What remains widely open is whether we can decipher the correct "Moral Oughts" without deceiving ourselves and that does actually guarantee a flourishing Civilisation and fulfilling lives for all people. I believe that the question can be answered better and better and in a way that actually improves everyone's lives. But Human Beings are not all that elastic. We break when stretched and pulled by all manner of pressures. I think we would be wise to seek things that are easier on us than some of these 'climb the top of the tallest mountains and jump off and fly like an Angel for 50 miles, take a right, and then Divine Enlightenment will envelope you and your people will have two centuries of flourishing and Divine

Blessings.” We ought to be much softer on ourselves than these sorts of Moral Oughts.