Truth about Relativism and Death Penalty: Analytical Essay

The construct of relativism portrays that every single opinion and belief being made should be taken into account as much as the next. Meaning that everyone should be entitled to their own value, where they get to choose if a certain topic is right or wrong. And that with global ethical issues, it should really only matter on the say of the people, to see how it defines or affects their lives. Relativism contradicts the idea of ethics as a whole since it is being described as that no single society or community can agree on an answer when it comes to global conflict (Velasquez and Meyer, “Ethical Relativism”). In this paper, I will explain why relativism is such a controversial topic among philosophers, and how much it goes against basic human morals. Also, because everyone can agree that murder is so inhumane and cruel, I will disscuss the death penalty and why it should be illegal due to the fact that it is still murder.

To have an opinion about the theory of relativism, one must fully have knowledge about what exactly it is. Like mentioned before, it is simply implying that nothing in the world is true or false. To each their own reasoning for why they believe the things they believe. And not one single person can argue and say they are wrong. For example, if someone believes that global warming is false and made up, then they are allowed to believe that regardless of the fact that many articles have proven it. Because of relativism that would mean that the person is completely right. If the theory of relativism is true, then some of the most famous and important key philosophy factors is set to be wrong. Moral absolutism would be one of the theories affected, it is the fact that some realities will always be significant and relevant, universally no matter in which framework it is being described as (Baghramian and Carter, “Relativism”). Absolutism gets to choose which issue should be questioned and judged, while the other is simply chosen to be true or false. Furthermore, it completely contradicts the idea of relativism since it says that there will always be a correct answer despite who and who says it.

Why is the theory of relativism so controversial amongst philosophers? Moral progress is what we all want to embark on, where we all can communicate peacefully and move on from the certain subject and make it better for everyone. As Emrys Westacott says, “if there is no neutral point of view from which such changes can be appraised, how can one argue that they constitute progress?” (Westacott, “Moral Relativism”). What Westacott is implying, that in a society where no one can agree on what is right from wrong, then there will never be any change made and it will be an endless loophole of people not trying to see other points of view. Another reason why the theory of relativism is highly disliked, is because of moral equivalence. Because there is no center point of agreement, this means that every belief should matter equally. And because at this point, where everything is the same, then it leads to no progress. To conclude, relativism simply goes against everything that is correct. There has to be a compromise in between people, where we all understand and comprehend what is right from wrong. So in that case, everything can run more smoothly and there would not be as much ignorance as there is in the present time.

Now that we understand that there is a right and wrong, I will discuss the death penalty, which also one of the most controversial and talked about issues and subject in the world. To begin, the death penalty is the act of killing someone because the government has agreed to do it as a form of punishment. Universally, everyone can agree that murder is wrong. At the moment, the

death penalty is currently legal in 30 states in the United States of America. Like discussed earlier, if murder is so inhumane and cruel, then why is the killing of someone automatically “normal” just because it is how the government wants to punish them. If the government really wanted to punish them, why can’t they simply punish them in jail for life. Another reason why it shoudl be abolished is because the death penalty is so unfair when it comes to people of color and how wealthy the person in trial is, they have more of a probability to have the execution done (aclu.org, “The Case Against the Death Penalty”). The government will always be more inclined to killing those who can’t fight back on their own, simply because it is easier to fight a fight with no help.

Besides the Death Penalty being rascist and unjustice, it has also made mistakes in the past. It is already bad killing somebody, but killing the life of innocent people already makes it more atrocious. According to aclu.org, “Since 1973, over 156 people have been released from death rows in 26 states because of innocence” (aclu.org, “The Case Against the Death Penalty”). Assuming that everyone knows that that is wrong, then relativism should not even be brought up into this discussion, which is how it should always be. Where everyone can agree on what is right and wrong, unanimously, it is morally wrong. Murder is wrong, killing is wrong, the death penalty involves killing, so it is wrong.

Bibliography

1. Baghramian, Maria, and J. Adam Carter. “Relativism.” Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Stanford University, 11 Sept. 2015, plato.stanford.edu/entries/relativism/#WhaRel.
2. “The Case Against the Death Penalty.” American Civil Liberties Union, www.aclu.org/other/case-against-death-penalty.
3. Velasquez, Manuel, et al. “Ethical Relativism.” Markkula Center for Applied Ethics at Santa Clara University, 1 Aug. 1992, www.scu.edu/ethics/ethics-resources/ethical-decision-making/ethical-relativism/.
4. Westacott, Emrys. “Moral Relativism.” Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, www.iep.utm.edu/moral-re/.