

Neutrality Paradox

Neutrality cannot exist.

Neutrality itself is a position.

There are 3 possible clauses:

- 1)Objective Neutrality
- 2)Subjective Neutrality
- 3)Contest/Frame neutrality

OBJECTIVE NEUTRALITY

It needs to define neutrality as a classification, which by itself is a position. Also, arguing for objective classification by itself on top of whatever classification you may define is also a position(classification).

Therefore objective neutrality cannot exist.

SUBJECTIVE NEUTRALITY

You need to hold your subjective position as neutral, or any other outside position that “you” may consider neutral distinct from yours, or define a classification. Which by itself is a position.

Also: If all positions are neutral on their own grounds or anyone can define anything as neutral, this can make anything neutral. If something is anything, its also nothing.

The only 2 ways out of this dilemma are

- 1) Defining solictism, or declaring by force/insist(logically/illogically) only my opinions are right or people who think like me, which invites covert objectivity, gets its authority from raw force/nihilism or consensus. Which by themselves, are positions.
 - a) Logical reasoning , enlightenment secular morality, by itself argues for reason concluding morality, or an equivalent. Conclusions are positions.
- 2) Pragmatist/utilitarian approach, which defeats the concept of neutrality itself to a position that by itself is not neutral(utilitarianism)

FRAME/CONTEST NEUTRALITY

Essentially refusing to take sides in a given dilemma.

There are 2 problems with this

- 1) defining which problems are worthy of considering at all(which by itself creates positions)
- 2) Deciding to stay neutral itself being a decision, therefore its a position.

Therefore, neutrality doesnt exist.

Mail me in dertlideniz0@gmail.com if you have arguments to debate about this.

H. Deniz Dertli