

## **Moral Relativism Must Be Logically Correct, Even if Religious Leaders Disapprove, Radical Author Says**

Geoffrey Berg recently gave a talk 'In Defence of Moral Relativism' to the Greater Manchester Humanists, which is summarised here.

Though successive Popes and religious leaders have attacked 'moral relativism', Geoffrey Berg, author of *Philosophy for Aliens* and *The Six Ways of Atheism* emphasises that in universal terms, the only logically realistic basis for any morality is 'moral relativism'.

As Geoffrey Berg revealed in his just published book *Philosophy for Aliens*, there is and can be no morality inherent to the Universe. He has written, 'Values do not pervade the Universe. In universal terms what is beneficial (and so in shorthand 'good') for some things and helps such things prosper is also generally corresponding harmful (and therefore in shorthand 'bad') for other things that either exist or would in other circumstances have existed. Therefore there is surely no universal 'good' permeating the Universe – page 15, *Philosophy for Aliens* Geoffrey Berg.

What people term 'good' and 'bad' is actually only 'good' or 'bad' for humans or rather to be precise, for some humans.

True, modern people usually believe in 'good' and 'bad' but that is a psychological folly or delusion most humans either innately have to develop (in much the same way as belief in God is a common, albeit better recognised psychological delusion among humans). In logical reality all human morality is and must be relative to the interests of some humans.

Priests may bemoan this and claim their religion provides absolute values but logic and the very nature of the universe prove according to Geoffrey Berg's recent book, *Philosophy for Aliens*, absolute values are not inherent in the universe.

However, Geoffrey Berg insists though moral relativism is ultimately necessarily true, that doesn't make an adequate system of morality for humans impossible. He says:

'People are characterised by and develop as being both individuals and members of a wider society. A sensible secular system of morality should comprehend people as both individuals with individual interests and freedoms and also at the same time as often dependent upon a society of humans.

So an appropriate, albeit morally relativistic system of morality could maintain and sustain societies of people while respecting individual people as generally free individual humans with minds of their own. This may be achieved in a pragmatic way, striking a pragmatic balance between individual rights and societies essential interests.

There is nothing wrong with replacing ancient dictates about behaviour handed down, often unquestioningly by religious leaders with a moral relativism that has a real understanding of realities that relate to and are appropriate to modern life and to circumstances never envisaged by ancient scriptures.

Moral relativism that is well thought out and pragmatically embraces both the inherent realities of the Universe and modern circumstances is far preferable and ultimately far more viable than absolutist, metaphysically deluded versions of morality based on ancient traditions and scriptures no longer appropriate to the modern world.

It is not moral relativism that is inappropriate. It is religious leaders of competing religions who keep peddling outdated, metaphysically deluded, scriptural canons of morality that justifiably lack credibility among sophisticated modern people that are now inappropriate.

The moral absolutisms of religions are increasingly failing and belong in essence to the past, Moral relativism rooted, in the realities of actual existence is the appropriate way for the future.