

Moral Compromise

Morals are defined as:

1. “concerned with the principles of right and wrong behavior and the goodness or badness of human character.”
2. “of or relating to principles of right and wrong in behavior.”

To Compromise is:

1. “something intermediate (*intermediate—being or occurring at the middle place, stage, or degree or between extremes, emph. mine, ret*) between or blending qualities of two different things.”
2. “to make a shameful or disreputable concession.”

(Definitions taken from Merriam—Webster Dictionary).

When individuals compromise their morals, the individual compromising is the only contributor of the party that compromises. This fact is evident simply from the standpoint that the individual compromising is the only participant of which the lowering of the moral standard is required.

As per the definitions, it is evident that principles of right and wrong behavior that manifest the goodness or badness of human character are recognized by society, and the blending of the two qualities results in one of the parties making a shameful or disreputable concession.

Such concessions are not new to any society: Solomon warned his son, saying, “*My son, if sinners entice thee, Consent thou not*” (Prov. 1:10). In the text a sinner *is a criminal, or one accounted guilty*. There has never been a time in the history of man where law did not exist. The apostle Paul affirms this, saying, “*for until the law sin was in the world; but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam until Moses*” (Rom. 5:14). As *sin is lawlessness*, it is evident that there was law from Adam to Moses and continues to this day. Even in the absence of a written code, there is that innate moral code that permeates all societies, nations and peoples in one fashion or another. If the *compromise* causes the least little reservation, recall the words of Solomon, saying, “*The wise shall inherit glory; But shame shall be the promotion of fools*” (Proverbs 3:35).

When the apostle Paul wrote to the young man Timothy, he said, “*neither be partaker of other men’s sins: keep thyself pure*” (1 Tim. 5:22). Sin, therefore, defiles and renders the partaker less than “*properly clean, that is, (figuratively) innocent, modest, perfect: - chaste, clean, pure*” (Strong’s).

A problem the sinner faces is that "*All the ways of a man are clean in his own eyes,*" (Proverbs 16:2), and coupled with another fact, i.e., "*There is a way which seemeth right unto a man; But the end thereof are the ways of death,*" (Proverbs 14:12), a man can justify a compromise, and though justified in his own eyes, is *accounted guilty* by God and men.

When viewed subjectively the sinner will justify many actions that will render them less than *properly clean*, but when viewed objectively the actions are manifested for what they really are. Before compromising *principles of right and wrong* that will render one's character *shameful or disreputable*, ask the question: Does the action allow *myself to have a conscience void of offence toward God and men always?* (Acts 24:16) ret