

Yes, we can talk about this

Posted: Tue, 3rd Sep 2013 by [Meg Wallace](#)

London's National Theatre recently hosted a debate about Freedom of speech, multiculturalism and Islam called *Can we talk about this?* The opening line was a question to the audience, "Are you morally superior to the Taliban?"

Anne Marie Waters, who was present, [wrote in a blog](#) that "very few people in the audience raised their hand to say they were."

This response, demonstrates a misconceived attempt to be seen as tolerant and 'multiculturalist'. People could not bring themselves to say their views are morally preferable to a group that, Waters points out, "denies women medical treatment, imprisons them in their homes, allows domestic violence, and executes people by stoning for having a private life or the audacity to not believe in God."

They fear being labelled, racist, 'Islamophobic', or discriminating against religion. Rather, they adopt a stance that treats all moral views generated by culture or religion as equally valid ('cultural relativism'). They confuse the distinction between the right to *think* as you want, and the right to *act* as you want.

It is generally disregarded that a global code of moral values has been established, and accepted by almost every nation in the world ? the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (UDHR). By acceding to this Declaration, over 190 nations have agreed to honour the principles of individual autonomy, equality, security, freedom of thought, belief, expression and association, subject to the norms of democratic government. In its statement of rights that apply, regardless of nationality, race, gender and social standing, the Declaration sets a morally accepted standard of behaviour for all individuals.

It has no place for cultural relativism, which leads to tolerance of cruel and inhumane practice in the name of 'culture', as if *culture* is the single source of moral acceptability.

Over 170 nations have signed the *International Convention on Human Rights* (ICCPR), turning the political rights set out in the UDHR into a binding agreement.

While individuals may practice their internal, illiberal beliefs in private, governments have undertaken to ensure their recognition of the political rights of everyone else, even within the same family, church or any other organisation. The trouble is, not one of these nations fully accedes to their promise.

Why were the UDHR and ICCPR adopted? Because it was globally agreed that the principles they enshrine are the most effective (albeit imperfect) means of promoting the well-being of humankind. They were considered superior to other moral and political principles, and therefore superior to cultural mores that did not work for the same ends.

At the very least, this is what has been formally decreed by the nations of the world. So holding that moral and political practices that promote this end are superior to others is neither unduly discriminatory or racist, but invokes a globally accepted 'superior' standard of living.

There is now a global inter-connectedness to the extent that indigenous people themselves often resort to the language of human rights to protect their culture from further unwanted encroachment.

Cultural relativism is a flawed basis for acceptance of others' values, as acceptance is based solely on the expression of those values by others, rather than on the *worth* of the values themselves. If, for example, [clerics justify](#) (or condone) certain action, say, female 'circumcision' (which is in effect genital mutilation) because it is tradition, or simply decreed by some 'authority' as mandated or acceptable, this reasoning is not sufficient to establish a general moral value that cannot be criticised.

However, if their reason is to prevent some harm to society in general, regardless of its religious beliefs, the argument goes to the content of the value espoused. We must be able to "

Meg Wallace

The views expressed in our blogs are those of the author and may not necessarily represent the views of the NSS.

- [Share on What's App](#)
- [Share on Facebook](#)
- [Share on Twitter](#)
- [Share on Email](#)
- [Subscribe to RSS Feed](#)

Tags: [Genital cutting](#), [Women](#)

Related Campaigns

•

[Women's rights](#)

End religious subordination of women and girls.

[Read More](#)

•

[End forced genital cutting](#)

No child should be subjected to unnecessary genital cutting.

[Read More](#)

Related Articles

1200 cases of FGM reported in three months – but data “likely” to underestimate

New data has shown a surge in reported cases of Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) in England, with over 1200 reports... [Read More »](#)

There should be no embarrassment over challenging Muslim treatment of women, says Justice Minister

Justice Minister Simon Hughes has said Britain should not be "culturally embarrassed" about challenging Muslims over... [Read More »](#)

Yes, we can talk about this

London's National Theatre recently hosted a debate about Freedom of speech, multiculturalism and Islam called *Can...* [Read More »](#)

Convictions for female genital mutilation: France - 100; Britain 0

Back in 1999, a group of MPs criticised the author Germaine Greer. They were astonished by her claim in a book that... [Read More »](#)

The “cutting season” and FGM in the UK: A national disgrace, a national shame

Last month, a coalition of Egyptian NGOs launched a campaign, 'Kamla' (meaning 'complete' in Arabic), against female... [Read More »](#)