

The U.S. Ban on TikTok: Justifiable Under Normative Relativism but Contradictory Under Normative Objectivism

Intro (Thesis Statement)

From a Normative Relativist perspective, the U.S. TikTok ban is justified as it aligns with American cultural values on national security. However, Normative Objectivism exposes a contradiction, as the U.S. has long criticized China for similar actions. Utilitarianism further suggests the ban may cause more harm than good. Ultimately, Normative Objectivism is superior, as ethical standards should remain consistent.

Body

1. Normative Relativism

- Morality is culturally dependent; the U.S. prioritizes national security and data privacy.
- The ban aligns with American values, making it justifiable under this framework.

2. Normative Objectivism

- Moral principles should be universal and consistent.
- The U.S. has condemned China for banning U.S. platforms, yet is now doing the same—this is contradictory.

3. Utilitarian Analysis

- Negative impacts: Economic harm (tech sector, creators) and limits on free expression.
- Since the overall happiness is sacrificed, Utilitarianism would oppose the ban.

4. Counterargument & Rebuttal

- Opposing view: "China bans U.S. platforms, so we are simply retaliating."
- Rebuttal: Retaliation does not justify ethical inconsistency; abandoning principles harms credibility.

5. Conclusion

- Normative Objectivism is ethically superior, ensuring consistency and avoiding moral double standards.

References

1. [The TikTok Ban: What You Should Know](#)
2. [The Grim Reality of Banning TikTok](#)