

Sociology some moral minima argumentative essay example

[Sociology](#), [Slavery](#)



Moral minima is a concept Lenn Goodman (2010) developed to explain that in society some things are simply wrong and therefore should not be tolerated. Many esteemed thinkers do appreciate his ideology and support him too. However, to say that he is correct or incorrect is to examine the context in which Goodman (2010) expands this theory of moral minima. In the following pages of this document the writer will offer some personal views concerning Goodman's (2010) moral minima and show some relationship of his view to relativism, which is a strong theory itself explaining right and wrong issues in society and life generally.

Personal perceptions

Goodman's (2010) assumptions pertaining to his moral minima theoretical perspective are that man imposed difficulties for minority populations are wrong. He cites slavery, genocide, terrorism, murder, rape, polygamy and incest (Goodman, 2010). As was posited earlier to say that he is accurate or inaccurate the context in which these assumptions were advanced must be considered

Therefore, it is my perception that these actions are wrong within Goodman's (2010) contextual frame work of life. It has to do with his culture; the period of history he is making them and his ethic background. Distinctly, it can be argued that this has nothing to do with the theory itself. But it must be understood that every theorist uses a paradigm through which to view his/her world.

As such, moral minima within the context advanced by Goodman's (2010) paradigm of society, is what justice is supposed to be during his historic and social evolution. It is clear then, for me to agree or disagree my conception

should be consistent with his. To this extent I would have to submit that I cannot fully agree neither disagree since while there is virtue in his assumption there is room for more speculation, also.

An issue documented as injustice for centuries towards a segment of people is slavery; more importantly African slavery. If some things are just wrong; why is it then that after so much talk about slavery being exploitation of man by man it continues in places like African and is an accepted practice? More so, children are enslaved and sexually abused and it is culturally acceptable. If Goodman's (2010) assumptions of some things are just wrong slavery is wrong, why is it that things continue to the same way for centuries without any change? Goodman (2010) also speaks out on genocide with references to the killing of Jews during that era. It would appear wrong to him, but it is very much appropriate within the context of the civilization in which it is practiced. Precisely, I cannot fully agree with Goodman (2010) here because it is wrong according to his conscience, but right in the eyes of persons performing these practices.

Therefore, to say some things are wrong without a qualifying explanation requires clarification. In modern societies no one tries to stop African slavery and genocide in some parts of the world. However, nations go to war to recover weapons of mass destruction. Young people die and become disfigured fighting wars. Where are the moral minima, here Goodman (2010)? Can we tell our presidents that this is just wrong? No! It is politically correct.

Challenges to relativism

Relativism points to the fact that there is neither absolute truth nor validity (Westcott, 2006). In this case how Goodman (2010) can prove what is right from wrong? Some may even argue that right and wrong morals are all figment of people's imagination since in many societies some things are right at some times and at another they are wrong. Then, it might be right for some segments of the society and wrong for another.

For example, just here in the United States of America during the Jim Crow Era it was right to have a segregated society. One set of people could not even use the same public bathrooms as others. They could not bathe on the same beaches as others. It was right within the eyes of the ruling politic. Even after some measure of absolute truth was established with reference to Goodman's (2010) moral minima, these same people still were not eligible to hold office as President of the United States of America until 2008.

Where is the absolute? Where lays the truth? There is no consistency. Laws change at the convenience of the ruling politic. These include immigration laws, political campaign laws, drug trafficking laws and even simple traffic laws. How can absolute truth be resolved within this context of benevolent decision making? Hence, the theory of relativism further argues that a person's cognitive biases interfere in establishing truth. As such, the only truth that exists is the one that lies in the consciousness of individuals (Westcott, 2006)

Conclusion

In summarizing this discourse it is clear that I cannot fully agree with Goodman's (2010) assumption of some things are just wrong. Yes, I agree that some things do appear to be wrong. Who and what defines right from wrong? Remember, according to relativism the infringement of cognitive biases can falsify right and wrong. Therefore, in essence one can conclude that there is no absolute truth and nothing is valid in itself if not evaluated within a particular context.

Work Cited

Goodman Lenn (2010). Some Moral Minima. Article

Westcott, E (2006) Cognitive Relativism. Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy