

# Moral Relativism

Dr. David Shaw

Moral relativism is a type of subjectivism which holds that moral truths are preferences much like our tastes in ice cream. It teaches that when it comes to morals, that which is ethically right or wrong, people can and should do whatever feels right for them. Ethical truths depend on the individuals, groups, and cultures that hold them. Because they believe that ethical truth is subjective, the words ought and should are meaningless because everybody's morality is equal. When faced with exactly the same ethical situation, one person may choose one response while another may choose the opposite. No universal rules of conduct apply to everyone.

## **SEVEN FLAWS**

1. Moral relativists can't accuse others of wrongdoing. Relativism makes it impossible to criticize others, because relativism ultimately denies such a thing as "wrongdoing." If one believes that morality is a matter of personal definition, then you surrender the possibility of making objective moral judgments about the actions of others, no matter how offensive they are to your intuitive sense of right and wrong.
2. Relativists can't complain about the problem of evil. The reality of evil in the world is one of the 5 objections raised against the existence of God. The entire objection hinges on the observation that true evil exists. Objective evil cannot exist if moral values are relative to the observer. Relativism is inconsistent with the concept that true moral evil exists because it denies that anything can be objectively wrong.
3. Relativists can't place blame or accept praise. These concepts are meaningless in relativism. There is no external standard of measurement to define what should be applauded or condemned. Without absolutes, nothing is ultimately bad. Neither is anything ultimately good. Relativists seek to avoid blame but are ready to accept praise.
4. Relativists can't make charges of blame or unfairness. The notion of fairness and justice are incoherent as both dictate that people should receive equal treatment based on some agreed external standard. Relativism does away with this. Justice entails punishing the guilty, but under relativism, guilt and blame do not exist.
5. Relativism can't improve morality. Relativists can change their personal ethics, but they can never become better people. Under relativism, one's ethics can never become more moral. Ethics and morals can change, but they can never improve, as there is no objective standard to improve against,

6. Meaningful moral discussions are out. If morals are relative and all views are equal, then no way of thinking is better than another. No moral position can be judged as adequate. If ethical disputes make sense only when morals are objective, then relativism can only be consistently lived out in silence.
7. Relativists can't promote tolerance. Morals are individual, and therefore we ought to tolerate the viewpoint of others. However, without objective moral rules, there can be no rule that requires tolerance of others. Relativists violate their own rule.

### **CONCLUSION**

Moral relativism is self-refuting. It is logically inconsistent and irrational. Relativism destroys the conscience and is unlivable.