

Argument synthesis



Society life is primarily organized along certain predetermined social patterns, which immensely affect the manner in which people carry out themselves. In such a system people are bound to act by the rules prescribed by the society's culture, which significantly influences individual response patterns. In this setting, individual choice becomes potentially overridden by society values, which are essentially reflected by the majority in society. Is therefore right for individuals to conform to the majority's demands? Or should this be an individual pursuit. Conforming to a majority's demands has been found to lead to negative output from individuals; hence, there is need for there to be significant freedom with an aim of promoting individual values at the expense of a majority.

Individual values determine the manner in which each independent value interacts leading to the development of working relationships. This is because in the daily interaction of persons, it is common to find different beliefs, knowledge levels, cultural affiliations, political inclinations, religious affiliations, and gender variations, which significantly affect the smooth manner in which each person can satisfactorily express himself or herself. Solomon sights that, " But consensus, to be productive, requires that each individual contribute independently out of his experience and insight" (Rosen 357). Individual independence in this case serves to represent unique values, which each individual brings forth into the society framework. Further, Weare observes that, " it is in fact impossible fundamentally to change social structures without changing the hearts and minds of the individuals who inhabit them" (Weare 23). This serves to portray the way in which the independent individual values have deeper roots that go beyond control

society social values. The two arguments satisfactorily serve to show how individual values play a significant role towards the actual dictation of society fundamentals as an entity.

The act of subjecting individuals to a common social conformity breaks the formal attachment and commitment to the achievement of society social goal. This is because there is need to incorporate all energies by establishing a participatory framework, other than diluting the individual efforts by instituting the element of submission. Solomon observes that, “ when consensus comes under dominance of conformity, the social process is polluted and the individuals at the same time surrenders the powers on which his functioning as a feeling and thinking being depends” (Rosen 357). ‘ Powers’ figuratively represents ‘ energies’, hence this shows how instituting mechanisms that will see individuals giving up what they believe is their effort or input going to waste, leads them into giving up on the entire process. Weare supports that, “ promoting social change and promoting individual change should not be seen as being in opposition: they are two sides of the same coin” (Weare 23). This further cements the concept of seeing individual and society fundamentals as being equal, hence any signs of making one party to be submissive to the other, leads to no integration. The two arguments illustrate how there exists significant chemistry between individual and society sentiments such that any sign of not showing recognition of individual input serves to derail the aspect of conformity.

Individuals determine how the element of conformity will be characterized by considering that indeed there are differences, which exist amongst us. This implies that there is need to recognize individual achievements and other

unique elements that define a particular group or individual, since generalising them merely serves to show lack of sensitivity. Solomon supports that, “ that we found the tendency to conformity in our society so strong that reasonably intelligent and well-meaning young people are willing to call white black is a matter of concern” (Rosen 357). ‘ White black’ here serves to illustrate the element of generalization or stereotyping, suggesting the all groups regardless of the unique aspects and varying input levels are the same. Giger and Davidhizar support that, “ stereotyping is the assumption that all people in a similar cultural, racial, or ethnic group are alike and share same values and belief” (69). This further serves to support the idea that a society is made of people from different walks of life, hence, the element of equating everyone as the same serves to dilute the whole affair of conformity. The two arguments show it is important to recognize and reconcile these differences in a manner that harmonises the individual and society in order to achieve conformity.

However, it is important to note that in a normal operating society there is always need for people to have certain common goals that are essentially reflected in their values. This implies that in as much as individual differences should be recognised the need to promote a certain level of coherence in society prompts conformity. Solomon agrees that, “ Life in society requires consensus as an indispensable condition” (Rosen 357). Here Solomon seeks to cement the fact that individuals need to accommodate a certain level of conformity in order to promote the essence of common goals and objectives. According to Weare achieving social dimensions involves participation, autonomy, and clarity, and that these elements are more

effective when they work together (40). In this perspective, we see that indeed the element of conformity is applicable in certain circumstances, all with an aim of achieving a common objective. The two arguments therefore serve to show the manner in which social integration through conformity can indeed serve to propel common goals of all individuals.

Conformity promotes unified perspectives of the society by raising concern for fellow members of a group. This implies that through conformity people are in a position to show significant care for their fellow beings on humanity grounds. Solomon sights that, “ when individuals refuse to relinquish of their own autonomy for the welfare of the larger group, anarchy may result” (Rosen 53). This shows that in as much as autonomy is a positive element, it can significantly lead to negative effects, if it is not subjected to a check mechanism. Wearies also significantly agrees with this fact, although she supports the element of encouraging appropriate sociability and that this should not be mistaken as insisting on conformity (98). Here is also evident that there are positive notions of conformity, which deserve to be promoted. The two arguments serve to show that conformity holds some form of advantage for the society even though this should be done carefully.

The desire for conformity shows the consistent advances made by a group or individuals to achieve a community perspective, which is essentially critical in the modern society. Despite this, it has been shown in such a setting individual values essentially determine the manner in which each independent value interacts leading to the development of working relationships within a group setting. Moreover, the intended act of putting individuals as subjects to a predetermined social conformity elementally

serves incorporate breaks into the formal attachment and commitment towards the achievement of a common society social goal. It is also shown that individuals essentially determine characteristic elements defining of conformity, by taking into account the existing differences among different individuals. However, the goals of a normal operating society demand the need for people to have certain common goals, which are essentially reflected in their values. Therefore, the arguments serve to support the fact that promoting individual values at the expense of a majority is a critical element towards the emancipation of conformity by promoting freedom among individual interactions such that negative output from individuals are significantly reduced.