

3/18/07 Hypocrisy – Part 9 – Equating Morality with Hypocrisy

Now let us examine the assertion that ‘occasional failures of virtue, of people who advocate living a virtuous life, does necessarily make them hypocrites’, by following the logical progression and consequences of this assertion. I am troubled by having observed this sentiment increasingly being conveyed within the media, particularly against Christians, within a context that does not acknowledge the obvious – that it ignores any concept of ‘degrees of’ – either you *are* or are *not* such. It has also been used in a context that ignored any relevance on how distant in the past the failure was, when accusing a person’s current character. – People change.

If this assertion were accepted at face value for its meaning, it follows that for all imperfect persons [I think that includes you and me ... and everyone else] to avoid the accusation of ‘being a hypocrite’ – *every* person, *must* at *all* times, *everywhere*, *only* aspire to hold values that he/she has already *perfectly* mastered. Those yet not mastered with perfect consistency – failed at – make one a “hypocrite”. – Really?! This limits the values which one may promote, to be *only* those *so low* and easily achieved that he/she will *never*, in *any* circumstance at *any* time, fail achieving them. – Huh?! The only way to avoid the slander of being termed a “hypocrite” is to promote virtually no spiritual values.

This consequently only allows amorality to be associated with non-hypocrisy as it equates promoting high moral values as hypocrisy – an attractive contrivance for promoting many humanist agendas. – What an utter farce. What an *unreasonable mode of reasoning*. It is “sub-rationalism”. ‘To be *good* you must be ungodly’!?! (Is. 5:20; 1 Pe. 3:16; Mic. 3:1b-2a). It is the practiced art of *foisting fraud*, by not tying the relevant consequences together with the assertion.

The adroit misuse of language in this manner was much more highly developed within the ancient Greek schools of the Sophists. Yet today, almost anyone with a witty tongue fancies himself an adept dialectician. ‘Witt’ is not always ‘Reason’.

Spiritual and philosophical differences stand, not only in contrast with, but also, in confrontation between godly principles and amorality. That is why many antagonists have adopted such an *unsound foundation* for accusing Christians. It is a cheap shot, a spiritually bankrupt and intellectually inept position. – Add the ‘condescending smirk’ and somehow, this sub-rational, bigoted judgmentalism gains credibility. Such accusations are arrogant in what they assert and ignorant of what they deny (Ro. 10:3; Jude v.10; 2 Pe. 2:12; 2 Ti. 3:4-5). This is not stated in hatred, rather in love of truth and in the hope that people will be delivered from such flawed reasoning (Jude v.23). Christians must be aware of such devices where *deluded* thinking pretends to be *critical* thinking (2 Th. 3:2; 2 Co. 2:11b).

If legitimated, it would be a victory against any noble and godly virtues. Mediocrity in all levels except selfishness would become the moral standard of the age. We can see that anti-Christian forces are currently active within our society (2 Th. 2:7; 2 Ti. 3:1-4, 13). If the consequences of this assertion are clearly unacceptable, then the assertion must be rejected. Of course God’s way of life and the ways of life of humanism are in conflict. – They are intrinsically antagonistic with each other (Gal. 5:17). Cont...