Ethical Relativism

1. Ethical Relativism: In this lecture, we will discuss a moral theory called ethical relativism (sometimes called “cultural relativism”).

   Ethical Relativism: An action is morally wrong (or right) for someone if and only if that person’s culture believes it is wrong (or right).

In short, if a society or culture DECIDES that some action is morally wrong, then it IS morally wrong for everyone within that society.

This makes morality relative. For instance, if one society says cannibalism is morally wrong, while another says it is morally permissible, then the fact of whether or not cannibalism is morally wrong will just be a relative one—namely, whether or not it is wrong for someone will just depend upon which society they are a part of.

We will now ask the question: Does some action become right or wrong just because one’s society SAYS it is right or wrong? Or rather, is it the case that there are some moral standards that apply to ALL people in ALL societies, regardless of whether or not those societies believe in those standards?

2. The Argument From Disagreement: Why believe that morality is relative? Relativists often say that widespread moral disagreement supports this conclusion. They say:

   1. Different people have different beliefs about morality.
   2. Therefore, there are no objective facts about morality.

Lots of people disagree about moral issues. There are heated debates and bitter arguments between people, and wars between civilizations, over what the morally right and wrong actions are. The relativist’s claim is that this disagreement is an indication that THERE IS NO OBJECTIVE FACT OF THE MATTER about morality.

Objectivity vs. Subjectivity: Relativism is a subjective view of morality. That is, the relativist claims that moral truths depends upon what people THINK about morality. So, morality is basically a matter of personal taste (or societal taste, etc.). Most other views, by contrast, are objective views of morality. That is, they believe that morality does NOT depend upon what people think. Morality is not a matter of taste. Rather, there are some things that are just plain wrong (or right) REGARDLESS OF WHAT ANYONE THINKS.
For example, “Ice cream is good” is clearly a subjective truth, since it is only true FOR ME because I THINK it is true. “The Earth is round” on the other hand is an objective truth, because it would be true EVEN IF EVERYONE THOUGHT THE EARTH WAS FLAT.

Now, in the argument above, the conclusion (2) does not follow from the premise (1). Just because people disagree about morality does not automatically make it true that morality is subjective. There is something missing. Some other claim is being assumed but is unspoken. Here is the argument with the missing claim explicitly included:

1. Different people have different beliefs about morality.
2. **Whenever people disagree about something, there are no objective facts about the matter.**
3. Therefore, there are no objective facts about morality.

**Objection:** But, this argument is obviously mistaken. Premise 2 is clearly false. To illustrate, consider the following argument, which is clearly flawed:

1. Different people have different beliefs about the shape of the Earth (some think it is spherical, while others believe it to be flat).
2. Whenever people disagree about something, there is no objective fact about the matter.
3. Therefore, there is no objective fact about the shape of the Earth.

The mere fact that there is disagreement about certain moral issues does not prove that there is no objective FACT of the matter, or that EVERYONE is right.

**How much disagreement is there?** Furthermore, the amount of moral disagreement in the world may not actually be as great as the relativist claims. The relativist will often point to actions that other cultures practice without hesitation or guilt, which seem horribly immoral to us, as proof of the claim that there is clearly disagreement about the principles of morality. But, this is not so obvious. For instance, consider one popular example that the relativist uses to prove their case:

- **Eskimo infanticide:** Eskimos used to regularly practice infanticide (killing infants). Their reason was that, if they did not kill some infants, their tribe as a whole would not survive. Their environment was so harsh that they only had enough food to support a limited number of babies. For instance, if the mother was already feeding one child, she could not produce enough milk to feed a second. If the tribe produced too many females, there would not be enough males to hunt and provide food. Furthermore, they did not understand the nature of procreation and birth control to take the necessary precautions. And so on... So, when an infant was born that threatened the tribe’s survival, they killed it.
Clearly, in our culture, we believe that infanticide is a moral atrocity. So, at first, there seems to be a HUGE disagreement between us and the Eskimos regarding infanticide. But, consider the predicament under which the Eskimos did this. If they did NOT do it, their whole society would have died off. They did not kill infants FOR NO REASON. Rather, they only did so when the survival of the whole population depended on it. Thus, it seems that they were really operating under some moral principle such as, "It is permissible to kill if doing so saves a great number of lives." But, does this principle seem obviously false to you? Most of us would actually ACCEPT this claim. So, perhaps there is not really moral disagreement after all. There are just different CIRCUMSTANCES.

3. Four Undesirable Implications of Ethical Relativism: We have already seen that the primary argument for relativism is flawed. Also, there may not be as much moral disagreement as the relativist claims. In this section we will see that, even if ethical relativism IS correct, then a number of incredibly undesirable outcomes follow:

(1) **No condemning of other cultures**: If morality were relative to one’s culture, there would be no basis for claiming that the practice of any other culture is morally wrong, no matter how atrocious their deeds seemed to us. For instance, if there were a society that practiced cannibalism, there would be no basis for us to condemn their actions. Of course, since OUR society believes cannibalism is morally wrong, it IS morally wrong for us (according to relativism). But, so long as the other society APPROVED of cannibalism, it would NOT be morally wrong for THEM to eat human flesh. But, this verdict seems mistaken. Shouldn’t we rather say that the people of that other culture are MISTAKEN about morality, and that they are doing something morally abhorrent which they MISTAKENLY believe to be morally acceptable?

(Or consider other practices like female genital mutilation—i.e., what Rachels called “excision”—and bride-burning and gendercide. Are we really prepared to say, “While those things are wrong HERE in the U.S. because we disapprove of them, there is nothing morally objectionable about them over THERE because the people in those societies approve of such things”? Or, rather, doesn’t it seem like such practices would be morally wrong for ANYONE to engage in, and that those who approve of them are simply MISTAKEN?)

(2) **No condemning of one’s own culture**: If ethical relativism were true, one could never criticize their OWN culture’s standards. Under relativism, it is impossible for any society to be mistaken about the moral status of any action. Under relativism, we decide morality by majority vote; we simply poll our citizens, and whatever the majority says is permissible IS permissible. Whatever they say is wrong IS wrong—for EVERYONE within that society. So, if the majority of our society says abortion is permissible, then all of those individuals who think that it is morally
wrong are simply mistaken. In short, if relativism is true, there is no justification for moral disagreement. But this seems false. Morality should not be decided by majority vote. Furthermore, it seems like it IS possible for one’s own society to have reached the wrong conclusion about some moral issue.

(3) **Moral progress is impossible:** According to relativism, there is no such thing as moral progress. In order for PROGRESS to occur, there must be a change for the BETTER. But, in order for something to get “better” there must be some standard that is being more closely adhered to over time. But, according to relativism, there is no such standard. So, even though our moral views DO change over time, our moral beliefs never get “better” on relativism—they simply get DIFFERENT.

In 1800, the majority of our society APPROVED of slavery. So, according to relativism, slavery was PERMISSIBLE in 1800. That is, slave-owners were NOT DOING ANYTHING MORALLY WRONG by owning other human beings as property. That fact alone is already repugnant. But now consider: Today, the majority of our society does NOT approve of slavery. According to relativism, then, slavery is MORALLY WRONG in the present day. Most people would like to say that our moral views today regarding slavery are BETTER now than they were 200 years ago. But, if relativism is true, we cannot make this claim. On relativism, neither the present view nor the 1800 view regarding slavery is morally better than the other. Our views are not “better” now—they are just different. But this seems false. It seems to most of us that a society’s moral beliefs CAN get better or worse over time—i.e., they can get closer or further from the real truth of the matter about what is right and what is wrong.

(4) **Absurd scenarios:** If ethical relativism is true, then we can think of absurd scenarios involving cultures where, if some members of that culture were to perform a wrong action enough times, it would become a right action. For instance: Consider a culture where 60% of the people think cannibalism is wrong, while 40% of the people think it is NOT wrong. In that culture, cannibalism is morally wrong, since (on the whole) the majority of the culture does not approve of it. However, now imagine that the pro-cannibalization citizens come up with a plan to change the moral status of cannibalism: They make plans to kill and eat half of the anti-cannibal citizens so that, once enough of the anti-cannibalists are gone, the citizens in favor of cannibalism would then be in the majority. In this way, cannibalism would go from being morally WRONG to morally PERMISSIBLE, since then (on the whole) the majority of that culture would now approve of it.

In short, by repeatedly performing a morally wrong action, the populace could make it become a morally right action. But, that is absurd. Any moral theory that allows for such absurdities to be possible must be flawed in some way.
4. Conclusion: It appears that ethical relativism must be false. This means that morality is not subjective. The moral status of actions like rape or murder are not merely a matter of taste. It is simply not true that things are wrong ONLY because most of us presently disapprove of them, or that they would BECOME permissible if our society suddenly started finding these actions to be acceptable. No, it seems obvious that actions like rape or murder are wrong not just because most of us find them distasteful—but rather because there is some OBJECTIVE moral truth of the matter about the moral status of such actions.

In short, some things are just plain wrong, regardless of what anyone thinks.

So, for the rest of this class, we will be explorers. We are on a quest for the objectively correct answers to a number of ethical questions. We will not decide any issue by majority vote. Rather, we will attempt to decide issues by appealing to plausible fundamental objective moral principles. For instance, here’s a plausible candidate:

*It is morally wrong to cause great harm to another individual for little or no benefit.*

It is plausible to think that the following moral truth would be true EVEN IF EVERYONE ON EARTH THOUGHT IT WAS FALSE:

An action is morally acceptable if, on the whole, it *benefits* all those affected by it. (Or, the flip side: An action is morally *un*acceptable if, on the whole, it *harms* all those affected by it.)

Isn’t it plausible to think that this principle is one that applies to ALL people of ALL cultures of ALL times, and is independent of what people think, believe, desire, etc.? This seems universally and objectively true, regardless of what anyone thinks. If there has ever been an individual, or a society, who thought that it was NOT wrong to cause great harm for little benefit (for example, blowing up an entire city full of people to make room for a new highway), they were simply mistaken.

But, this is something that the relativist must reject (for, if ENOUGH people in our culture thought that this principle was false, it WOULD be!).

**What we are NOT saying:** Sometimes, people are offended by the prospect of rejecting relativism. They point out that there is a great deal of truth to relativism, and this should not be ignored. Lots of things ARE relative, they say. And furthermore, relativism preaches TOLERANCE, which is a good thing! So, we should clarify two points. Here is what we are NOT saying:
1. **We are not claiming that “NOTHING is culturally relative.”** We have not made this claim. It is false. Lots of things ARE culturally relative. For instance, in one country, it might be considered rude to slurp soup out of a bowl without a spoon, while in another, it is standard practice. But this case is non-moral. There is no **morally** right or wrong way to eat soup. How one should eat soup is a matter of convention only. Lots of (non-moral) issues ARE a matter of societal taste or personal preference. We are not disputing this fact. We have only said that MORAL issues are not a matter of societal taste or personal preference. So, one important task ahead of us is to figure out which issues are moral ones and which issues are not.

2. **We are not claiming that “We should be intolerant of other people’s beliefs or practices.”** Claiming that there is a correct answer to moral questions is NOT the same as claiming that we should be rude or intolerant of everyone who disagrees, or invade every country whose citizens engage in some practice that we think is wrong, and force them to change. For one, determining what the objectively true moral principles are turns out to be an incredibly difficult task. Second, it is quite possible that **tolerance** is one of the morally **RIGHT** actions. While we clearly SHOULD be intolerant of SOME actions which are OBVIOUSLY morally wrong—for instance, if another culture practices genocide, we should not condone, endorse, or tolerate such a thing since it is clearly morally abhorrent—there are lots of other issues where tolerance is probably the best course of action.
Ethical Nihilism

**Ethical Nihilism:** This is the view that there is no such thing as right or wrong. There is no good or bad.

This view is sometimes called “error theory.” By this, it is meant that, whenever we make statements like, “He is a bad person,” “She did the right thing,” or “Stabbing babies for fun is wrong,” we are simply mistaken. These claims are all false. There simply are no such things as right, wrong, good, or bad. The argument from disagreement is also used by nihilists:

**The argument from disagreement:** There is disagreement across the world over what things are good, bad, right, or wrong. Therefore, there are no such things.

Once again, we seem to be able to generate the following argument:

1. People disagree about morality.
2. Whenever people disagree about something, there are no facts about the matter.
3. Therefore, there are no facts about morality.

First, note that this argument is valid. If the premises are true, then the conclusion must also be true. However, this argument is not sound. As we stated above when discussing relativism, premise 2 is clearly false. Consider a specific example:

1. People disagree about the nature of JFK’s death (some believe he was killed by Oswald, while others believe there were several shooters responsible).
2. Whenever people disagree about something, there are no facts about the matter.
3. Therefore, there is no fact of the matter about the nature of JFK’s death.

Obviously, this conclusion is false. There is some fact of the matter about JFK’s death, despite disagreement. Clearly, then, the argument from disagreement is unsound.

**Against Nihilism:** Note that the ethical nihilist must accept some conclusions that many of us feel very strongly are not true. Things like:

(a) It is not the case that nuclear war would be bad.
(b) It is never the case that enjoyment is better than excruciating pain.
(c) It is never the case that stabbing a baby for fun is wrong.

The nihilist would have to accept all of these statements as true. For, they reject that there are any such things as good, bad, (better, worse), right and wrong. But that is extremely counter-intuitive.
The Moorean Shift: Ultimately, we are faced with a choice between two competing conclusions. Argument 1 (nihilism):

1. If nihilism is true, then no action is morally wrong.
2. Nihilism is true.
3. Therefore, it is never the case that stabbing a baby for fun is wrong.

And argument 2 (against nihilism):

1. If nihilism is true, then no action is morally wrong.
2. It is sometimes (always?) the case that stabbing a baby for fun is wrong.
3. Therefore, nihilism is false.

These two arguments share premise 1, but have different second premises. Premise 2 of the second argument is the denial of the conclusion of the first argument, and vice versa (premise 2 of the first argument is the denial of the conclusion of the second argument). They are both valid, but they cannot both be true. (This scheme of forcing a choice between two competing arguments was made famous by philosopher, G.E. Moore)

The choice then, is whether to accept that “nihilism is true” or that “it is sometimes wrong to stab babies in the face for fun.” But surely the claim about stabbing babies being wrong seems MUCH more obvious than the truth of nihilism. Do you agree?

The Argument From Evolution: Despite the above reasons to reject nihilism, there is often a lingering suspicion among students that nihilism is true. Many will claim that our “morals” are merely the product of biological evolution—sentiments which have been biologically selected for not because they are the perceptions of some “real, moral truth”, but because they are advantageous for survival. For instance, we generally believe that killing is wrong. But this is only because any species that promoted killing would quickly die out. (Another good example is the moral taboo of incest.)

Reply: Is it true that our moral sentiments are the ones that best promote our species’ survival, or the propagation of our “fittest” genes? There seem to be several ethical intuitions that we have which HINDER the survival of the fittest. For instance:

- We ought to care for the sick and/or elderly.
- Killing people with genetic diseases or disabilities is morally wrong.
- Rape is morally wrong.
- Eugenics programs are morally wrong.

If moral sentiments were just selected for evolutionarily, not to get at objective moral truths, but to produce the sort of behavior that is best suited to promoting the survival of the fittest, does it seem likely that we would feel very strongly about the above?