

## Truth is real - it is objective truth

Objective truth means the truth is just there and we are passive recipients of the truth. Its independent. We do not make it or create it but only learn it. The main objection to this is that people who claim to be honest truth seekers often disagree with each other on core matters. Another objection is that we never learn things as they really are but only how they appear to be to us. The main objection is useless. Dishonest people and people who don't understand something are not evidence that there is no truth. They are evidence that there is even if everybody has the wrong truth. The problem with not knowing things as they are but how they appear forgets that appearances can still be accurate enough.

Whatever is true is a fact for me and for you and in itself. There is nothing you can do to make the truth not the truth. Truth is not about you or anybody else. Truth is truth no matter what. That is the reality and opposing it is deliberately harmful and toxic.

Truth is not about how you know but about what you know. You cannot claim to know who stole Jesus' body by saying you know how you know. You either know or you do not.

If God exists then he alone matters implying all truth is his truth. All truth is not God's truth. Truth has nothing to do with belonging to anybody. It is not about what anybody thinks or wants or needs. If there were no God atheism would be the truth so how could truth belong to God? No truths at all belong to God. None. The argument that morality is objective truth presumes that all truth belongs to God which is nonsense. In fact truth would matter more than moral truth for no subdivision of truth can matter if truth does not matter. The attempt to equate God with truth is an insult to truth and leads to lies. God is not God for truth is what matters ultimately. God cannot be God and if he contradicts that he deserves no honour.

---

Archbishop Fulton Sheen:

"Truth must be sought at all costs, but separate isolated truths will not do. Truth is like life; it has to be taken on its entirety or not at all. . . . We must welcome truth even if it reproaches and inconveniences us -- even if it appears in the place where we thought it could not be found."

"Those who hate Truth and fear Goodness are ... fighting against it, and yet they know theirs is a losing battle. The more violently men hate truth, the more they think about it; the more they fear the goodness that demands perfection, the more they know it is what they really seek."

Relativism teaches that nothing is really right or wrong. It says right and wrong are just opinions and we must respect the opinions of those who totally disagree with us. It is popular in politics. A country uses it as an excuse for addressing human rights violations in one nation through war and not another. It is a good cover for a nation that fights a tyrannical nation over oil and doesn't want to admit it.

If morality is relativistic, it does not follow that the same is true of truth. But if truth is relative then it follows that morality is relative.

Suppose that relativism is evil.

What is the worst evil?

Moral relativism or the notion that truth is relative?

The latter is the worst. It means that if it is true for the world that Jesus Christ was Jack the Ripper then it really is true. We make facts - we do not discover. If you hate moral relativism and you say that truth is relative then you are saying moral relativism is true. You are contradicting yourself.

We can be logical in how we live our lives and still make mistakes. Logic is a good tool but living can get in the way. There is no excuse for believing illogical doctrines. The problems with logic turn many to moral relativism but moral relativism is a non-solution. Its worse than the problem of intolerance and arrogance it addresses. It is unfair to reject logic just because

we get it wrong at times.

It is said that everybody believes in relativism up to a point. This is an example. Imagine trying to be ethical if your nation faces war. Few will agree on how to deal with it. Whatever decision is made, will be based merely on opinion.

But it is possible to believe in real objective moral principles and be at a loss how they apply. This is not the fault of the principles but of our lack of knowledge. The indecisiveness and the need to come up with an opinion does not then make one a relativist.

The relativist seeks to avoid saying there is such a thing as objective truth. But then she says relativism is objectively true!

The believers say that people who declare that they cannot believe in the Christian faith because they cannot accept the Christian doctrine of moral absolutes - that is that some things are absolutely wrong - are making a statement for which there is no proof and so it is an act of faith, a leap of faith. Instead of rejecting faith they just choose an alternative faith to the Christian faith. Christians go too far with the moral absolutes. It is one thing to say that stealing is absolutely wrong. But another to say that you need to go to Mass on a Sunday and on Church feast days and its absolutely wrong not to. The Church invents moral absolutes. It gives the real ones a bad name. The person who invents moral absolutes is no better than the person who denies they exist. And could be worse!

The Church of Rome claims to believe that human reason when correctly used is to be seen as inspired by God. But inspiration is not reason and reason is not inspiration. If God puts thoughts in your head that means you are not reasoning then. The Church is trying to cover up its opposition to reason. Its devotion to reason is lip-service. It's true devotion is to religious and moral relativism.

The Church itself practices moral relativism despite its savage and panic-stricken condemnations of it. Indeed the Church is the best friend moral relativism ever had.

To say that truth is real means that the lie is the opposite of the truth. Good is the opposite of evil. Good and evil may come together to make grey but they are still separate and opposites. There is no possibility of compromise with evil in any issue and particularly not in important issues. There is no possibility of saying nothing when lies are told in matters of great importance.

They say that to say there really is such a thing as say justice and its not just opinion is to say morality is absolute. They say that those who say it is not are making a new absolute. For example, they are saying its unjust to say there is such a thing as real justice. So it seems the choice is between many absolute rules and the rule that there is no absolute. The rule that there is no absolute is saying there is an absolute after all. It seems hypocritical but if it is the best option then we have no choice in the matter and it is not hypocritical in that case. We might adopt it in the light that no rule is perfect and the less absolute rules we have the better.

If the only rule is that there are no absolute rules, it does not follow that the rule really is inconsistent. It is only saying there are no absolute rules but itself.

The argument that it is inconsistent and hypocritical is wrong. It is the only argument religion and other authorities has got against it.

Religion bases its opposition to relativism on the argument. But in doing so, religion is itself relativist! It contradicts its ethic of love in such a basic matter.

Relativists like to say, "What is true for me is up to me. What is true for you is up to you. Let us celebrate our differences. They do not matter." Relativism sounds like a terrific antidote to arrogance. But if it is up to me to decide what truth is, and that makes me right, surely that is arrogance? I claim something is true just because I want it to be or think its true. That is worse than any arrogance that resides in those who believe in real truth and who hold that true is true regardless of what people think about it. The arrogant person who claims to know objective truth is less dangerous and less arrogant than the relativist.

Is it better to have one absolute than many? Some would say yes. They say it is the lesser evil. They will be at war with those who make more absolute rules.

To hold that there is objective truth helps us unite. If we are disunited, at least we will be on the right path if we follow reason and seek the objective truth. Relativism only divides and does not really care about humility at all. It makes it too easy for a person who believes in objective truth to lie to others about what he thinks is right and wrong and dress it up as relativism. Evil people will manipulate a relativist society to their hearts content.

A religion that claims to be the truth should be followed without cherry-picking but only if it really is the truth. I am atheist and do not like the Church but I agree that those who cannot see it as the truth should leave. Otherwise they end up supporting what they think is a manmade religion. It is stupid to regard everybody that claims to be Christian as Christian or qualified to speak on what Christians believe. If some belief is not Christian and anti-Christian no Christian can make it Christian.