

In defense of prejudice essay



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

The article “ In Defense of Prejudice”, by Jonathan Rauch is about opposition to “ hate speech” (n. d.) as he puts it in this work. Prejudice refers to prejudgment i. e. making a decision about a case before getting to know the reality of the situation of the case. It can be termed as making premature judgment about someone or something without really knowing what they are about or who the person really is.

Francis L. Lawrence – the President of Rutgers University – has been insisted on to resign by editorialist and protesters for his description of blacks as a disadvantaged community that does not have a higher than average hereditary background. This came forward to mean that black people are less intelligent as compared to other races. Ralph Reed – the Christian Coalition’s Executive Director – called a press conference in response to religious rights critics denouncing an outbreak of opinions differing from the Christian beliefs. A California State University student filed a \$2. 5 million sexual-harassment case against a psychology professor, claiming that one of her lectures had anti-male bias that violated rules of the campus making him feel “ raped and trapped” (Rauch n. d.). Universities, workplaces, and newsroom authorities have set up anti-racism anti-sexism procedures. According to crusaders, it’s only after racism plus other forms of discrimination i. e. prejudgments are done with that a society can be fair, and the minority be safe. In the article, Rauch says that although people hope that a day will come when any form of segregation against persons will stop, he doubts that such a time will come to exist. The author also claims that freedom of expression comes with racism expression. Some people as well believe that homosexuality is sickness and that homosexuals are a

threat to children. This phenomenon is not comprehensive and hence will always be feared.

Hostility towards Jews also called anti-Semitism has proven to be harder than influenza virus. Attainment of diversity of views, in addition known as pluralism, brings with it racism, sexism, and communism. We should not only eradicate all forms of prejudgments but finding out ways of making the best of it. Prejudice eradication is meaningless. A student at the University of Michigan in a classroom discussion said that he had come to consider homosexuality a disease whose cure he believes to be therapy. He later faced a hearing for violating the victimization of people based on sexual choice policy of the school. Many of Americans who do not see themselves as haters consider homosexuality a disease. The difference between a prejudiced belief and a controversial belief is very thin. God does not like homosexuality, for example, is a factual statement but "American criminals are all black" is a biased statement. It is hard to differentiate a prejudiced statement from a factual one indeed. The idea of pluralism is not doing away with prejudice still making it productive socially by prejudice against prejudice and truth against truth and exposing both to public criticism. At the end, all that is left is true base of knowledge. According to the popular view, science is a reason against prejudice and open mindedness, yet the ugly truth of the situation is that scientist is biased. By David L. Hull, the aforementioned circumstance is the strength of science; hence the scholars have different biases. Another ugly truth is that scientists are persons who invest in and defend their ideas with a passion.

Some people who do not believe in the praised idea of science think that in a non-judgmental system individuals should similarly be not-judgmental. A knowledgeable regime does with prejudice and avoids any attempt to do away with it. In accordance with Charles Sanders, an American philosopher, when an agreement is hard to be reached, the effective approach is massacring all those who thought otherwise about the idea. Most societies' priests, mass opinion, dictators etc. are identified errors and the makers of those were done away for silencing all others who were against. For so long this method has been used to hold doctrines in place.

In "intellectual pluralism," we kill people who make mistakes instead of each other or, like Karl Popper pointed out, science is letting the hypothesis we make die instead of ourselves. Pluralism not only makes a place for minorities in our society but also protects them. Actively challenging a policy should not be taken seriously of which the crusade against prejudice puts away such warnings. The prejudices in society cannot be just eliminated, and if some would be outspoken by you, you might be found a discriminator.

Prejudiced words should be done away only with prejudice at all. UCLA Professor Mari Matsuda shares same views. Due to critics, newspapers have put forward lists of banned words not to be used in their pages.

Purists discovered doing away with judgmental words does not help because to replace those persons will go on find other ones. According to a Stanford Professor, a community with one racist is not that safe since people will feel uncomfortable as long as the racist is present. Many universities have put in place codes against discriminative speech of which some punish targeted individuals. The fight against racism goes beyond eliminating racial words at

school. In criminal law, a crime accompanied by bias elevates the crime. In a workplace, courts have put a restriction against discriminative language.

Purists try to eliminate prejudice to protect minorities. The whole objective of eliminating and criticizing prejudice is hard, in fact.