**The Mighty & Dangerous: Relativism**

The statement *“The only truth is that there is no truth”* is self-refuting because it begs the question: *is your statement true?* If you say **yes**, then truths do exist, if you say **no**, then the statement isn’t true.

Naturally, because the statement tries to validate itself by claiming that truths do not exist, it must *use a truth* in order to do so. Therefore, if the goal is to continue to affirm the statement’s validity, one would have to answer *“Yes, the statement is true, there are no truths”*– we can see how it enters an infinite regress because each following affirmation must refute itself in order to support the previous statement.

It may seem purely innocent and based on language, a mere trick of the human mind to say something that contradicts itself, and yet whether we believe in it or not seems to hold much value for us as individuals as well as in our societies, and can definitely impact our realities (if it did not, we would not say or think about such an idea).

**Disbelievers**

Those who draw the conclusion that the statement is not true, and affirm that there are many kinds of truths: objective truths, subjective truths and relative truths, conveniently step beside what such a statement points towards; it seems to address our need for an objective truth which aligns itself with our subjective truths in order to create harmony between people while also serving as a strong, unshakable foundation for belief. The idea is that if we all believe the same, **undeniable idea**, that some kind of finality will emerge, giving us morality, purpose, value, meaning and well-being, all in one go.

Such a statement: that *the only truth is that there are no truths*, it certainly comes closest to achieving such a powerful idea, however it is still deniable and so we are left with disbelievers on account of it.

**Believers**

If we were to believe in this powerful but deniable idea anyway, what would we have? One may find it interesting to know that the idea behind the statement is called *“relativism”*, which is definitely deep and useful, but is also dangerous if taken to be the objective truth between all people, and we have had the dangers associated to it occur, again and again.

The utility in relativism is that it helps us throttle the peace between people: *“What is good for you, I will not argue because there are no absolute truths, and you can do the same for me”*. This is lovely up until we find ourselves doing horrible things and calling them “good”, precisely because the relativity between my definition of good and yours, supports my ability to do so.

**Co-existence**

If believing in relativity as the objective truth leads to moral destruction, and it is also morally destructive to hold fundamentally opposing objective truths, what of their combination? They currently co-exist anyway, so what were to happen if they could somehow be connected in such a manner that allows for a greater stability and cohesion between people?

Ultimately it all depends on how you define “truth”; most rarely come to properly define the words they use, which leads to, well, problems when it comes to truth. So let us agree on a basic, logically undeniable definition for truth: **Something which exists.** If we can agree that all things which can exist, whether physical or mental, constitutes *truth*, then we can be reasonably satisfied that truth is rooted in an objective experience we all share: *existence*. Rene Descartes pointed to this with his “Cogito Ergo Sum” (I think therefore I am).

The problem however, is that such a definition for truth does nothing for us: we can not extract any utility from it- if everything is true, by symmetry of identity nothing is *un*true and no direction can be given us when it comes to all the complicated questions which follow after the question weve just answered: *What is truth*?

This is where relativity becomes apparently useful because it has the power to organize every deriving question we have about the world and our experience of it. What is an important or unimportant question to one person or another is asked and answered according to their own needs. This is what uncovers the power of relativity but at the same time, is also what *dis*covers its actual role in this reality: *that it is* *the connection* (Not a foundation).

This means relativity finds itself between *two* other things; the first is objective truth, that which we have identified as the belief system it co-exists with, yet not compatible because objective truth can only be defined by mutually disagreeing people…or can it?

The answer to this question can only come to light if we find out *what* relativity connects objectivity to.

**Duality**

I propose, under the current definition of truth (that it is all forms of existence), that such truth *is* the objective truth we all share. This being the case, we also subjectively experience this objective truth in different ways- in other words, we all **relate** to the objective truth differently. This would immediately imply that relativity is the connection between the objective truth of existence and **us**.

Looking at it this way: Objectivity <—Relativity—>Humans, we can see that there is a clear pathway to our alignment in belief of truth but still no answers as to what is *moral, meaningful and purposeful*.

It would necessitate a fundamental understanding of how human beings function to begin, not to align our morals but to at the very least, make them compatible or to make humans less friction-prone.

I’ll suggest then, that we are binary beings: every piece of information gets sorted into two categories because 1: we cannot compute more than that effectively and 2: it does not serve our purpose of survival. Most of our ancestors who stood around thinking about what was good or bad, objective or subjective and true or untrue, died from not being as quick to make the necessary judgments it took to save themselves from a preying animal or an eager enemy trying to steal their food. No primitive human stood around to think “Maybe there’s a third option” and lived to tell the tale…that is until we found out that cooperation could allow us more time to think this way, which allowed us to come up with technology. So think we did, right in to the moral predicaments we experience today. We went from survival mode, a time when morality was no question, it was simply instilled in us from tradition, to a time where we must now survive our own minds and souls, while only having a binary system to do so.

So why not embrace it? If we are the “beings of duality” on the other end of the objective existence which birthed us, then the relativity between each other does not just stand to connect humans together, it serves to connect individuals to a reality which self-sustains- this means it includes everything needed to move forward; it may not seem to us that we *are* moving forward yet we continue to look back at a past we consider rocky but forward nonetheless.

The trick is to apply our dualistic mode of thinking to the very morality we use it for: Can we not see a connection between good and bad? A *relativity* in other words? If we were to see what is morally good and bad, not as two forces which contradict each other, but as *one* force with two ends instead, I can imagine a world in which acceptance would prevail, allowing the energy we usually use to resist each other, to be used for growth, understanding, Love and in turn, a greater capability for moral reasoning.

**Finality**

The final argument would then follow: If “truth” is *all that can exist*, and that this truth is the objective foundation we all share but relate to differently, then morality exists in three manners: **objectively, relatively** and **naturally**. Therefore, being that each of these three exist, they are true. What then, is there to argue over?

Think of it, moral objectivity exists in the form of anthropomorphic religions- “God’s truth”. Moral relativity exists in the form of socio-economic ideology such as communism- “The people’s truth”. Third is what I call moral “naturality”, being that it is *we* natural human beings who are the moral agents of the previous two moral systems; nature decides which genes get passed on and people decide which morals correspond to their own nature.

Pragmatists would correctly raise the obvious issue at play here: how does one come to make a “good moral decision” when it comes to abortion, death penalty, welfare and *fill in the blank*? Here I would ask right back: *How have we come to make those decisions so far? and should we perhaps consider using all three moralities together to make our moral decisions? Haven’t we been doing that anyway? Is it sufficient to just become of aware that this is what we are doing?*

Simply put, we are moral beings, and this I can behold to be true: the only “should” that remains to be fulfilled is the acceptance that we *do*.