

The right conclusion
from that is the fact
that hurting peoples
feelings is bad a...

[Sociology](#), [Immigration](#)



Objectification according to the word web dictionary definition refers to a concrete representation of an abstract or an idea or principle. Immigrants are people who move to foreign countries and live there permanently and people of color are the non white skin, like blacks and Indians. Objectification has diverse meanings. Some schools of thought, Luke Muehlhauser for instance, maintain that objectification refers to the act of treating others as a means to an end, without being keen on their goals feelings and preferences.

With objectification, not only is vivid the fact that the overall change of culture will not solely be as a result of the actions of an individual, but also that the overall change in the culture is partly to blame due to an individual's actions. And the overall culture is to blame due to all of the individuals actions. This seems to me as an odd definition owing to the fact that it seems incomplete given that there are numerous cases that match the definition but which cannot be branded cases of objectification.

Secondly, if we say that objectification is " using someone as a means to an end" it is therefore not vivid why objectification is implicitly bad; however, the word bears a strong connotation of condemnation.

After all, we use others to gain that which we need all the time. When I want to move from one state to another, I use my chauffeur, I therefore use the chauffeur as a means of reaching my destination. I'm not actually thinking about his feelings and goals. And in my senses I doubt if he really wants or expects me to be.

Of course, if lack of concern about other people's feelings means that you harm them, like if I were arrogant to the chauffeur then it is easy to see why

it is bad.

All in all everybody is entitled to their opinion and if objectification is bad or otherwise, we have to make a choice and stand by it.

Objectification is not necessarily an issue at the individual level. When person X uses person Y to achieve what he (X) wants, as long as person Y is not harmed, then it is ethically right. The problem arises in situations where X's wants to treat Y's systematically to achieve their end needs in a similar kind of way.

The reason being both the parties will begin to think about each other in not so a friendly manner. People's attitudes are determined by the way those around them think and act. Therefore, it can result into this effect which is self-reinforcing, further causing a ripple effect which ends up igniting other kinds of interactions and interactions that many X's and X's would have found accomplishing.

Therefore this is my current argument. Now, this is the least can do to sympathies with the those who are not bothered by the idea of a particular man having an eye for a particular woman only for sex and those who hate the ideology of society in which most men's interest in women is just for sex and I tend to think that such a society would be sub-optimal for both women and men. In fact this part is very much under-appreciated in the objectification debate. So to say, it as well poses quite interesting troubles for utilitarian morals.

How can you possibly assign blames in cases where a single person does something weird and is harmless and a group of people does a similar weird thing and is considered harmful? Take for instance the pollution of the

<https://assignbuster.com/the-right-conclusion-from-that-is-the-fact-that-hurting-peoples-feelings-is-bad-argumentative-essay-sample/>

environment. Where one can argue that; “ given that everyone is polluting, it’s not going to make any difference if I do it too.” With objectification, not only is vivid the fact that the overall change of culture will not solely be as a result of the actions of an individual, but also that the overall change in the culture is partly to blame due to an individual’s actions. And the overall culture is to blame due to all of the individuals actions.

The trivialness makes it hard to clearly figure out the extent to which any individual deserves reprimand for these actions. Another case of men objectifying women is borrowed from Adrienne Rich in her book “ Women and Honor: some notes on lying.” Where she talks of women’s honor lying on their chastity and fidelity to their husbands

She laments how they have been depicted as genetically deceitful, vacillating, whimsical, and subtle. She continues to say that they have even been rewarded for lying. She says that men have been expected to tell the truth about facts, not about feelings. They are not expected to talk about feelings whatsoever yet even about facts they have continually lied. Women in this scenario must be honorable to their husbands and what do they get in return?

They get Men who tell lies and those who do not show any forms of feelings to their women. This is somehow objectifying. My question is, don’t women also objectify men? A case in point is when a young average woman seeks the companionship of an old rich man for her security and children’s education.

Men objectifying women is not the only kind of objectification. This was just

but an example to enhance a proper understanding of the word objectification given that its definition wasn't clear from the beginning. Child adoption is another case where objectification is seen. A Muslim child is adopted by a Christian family by all means the child has to shed off the Christian beliefs, practices and culture and adopt the Christians, likewise to a Christian child adopted by a Muslim family. This happens against the victims wishes or simply happens without much concern on the victims feelings.

Look at Fanon's book *The Fact of Blackness* he talks of racial discrimination. He tells us how color prejudice was something common in the west. He painfully acknowledges the fact that blacks were identified with their slave ancestors

The ancestors were enslaved. They were used for defective gains. In return, they were reprimanded and even killed mercilessly if they made attempts to strike. The fact that black people alias "negroes" were inferior according to the white people made them look over more miserable and for this they were ill treated.

These concepts were used to serve ill purposes most of which were never appreciated. Everything a black skin did was referenced to a white counterpart. Black doctors' competences were judged by the white ones. He says that black skin was used as objects not humans. "I came in to the world imbued with the will to find a meaning in things, my spirit filled with the desire to attain the source of the world, and then I found that I was an object in the midst of other objects."

Black people were used as toys to make fun. When a white person thought of an insult, or when angered the right person to channel the anger to was the

black person. This clearly explains objectification. White people used black people to settle their scores and calm their anger.

Black people were more often than not studied and addressed in public conversations as problems of the current world rather than as people facing problems brought up by the modern life. The black people were imprisoned amongst the gues leading to a form of injustice done to them for challenging the unfairness of a social system.

Black people were considered in capable of loving. Black women were unlovable and black men could not love and even if they did they were judged and references were made with the white people. Al these did not only happen to blacks but also to Indians Jews and other people of color Issues concerning immigration have since dominated the current mainstream media reporting about the Latinos as it was ruled on the disputable Arizona immigration law by the U. S Supreme Court, and President Obama changed deportation status for persons under the age of thirty and were brought to the country illegally as children.

The coverage also emphasized a major defect in the Media's handling of Latinos: they are seldom mentioned in reporting on issues far from immigration.

The significance of the immigration cannot simply be ignored. In the past forty years or so, twelve million people are estimated to have got their way into U. S. A from Mexico. Marginally more than half the number did so legally.

That is according to the Pew Hispanic Center's report which was updated in May. The tendency to center on immigration is understandable, says Aly Colon. "It's obvious for the media that this is a natural way to go," says Colon, observing that a good number of Americans, with those in the media as no exceptions, do not have a very well intercommunicated idea of Latinos' role in the American society. "The media tends to objectify groups outside the mainstream," Colon says. "Until you know people by their name they are not people."

Latino activists consent that the media ought to expand its coverage outside immigration issues particularly then, that they were approaching the general elections. This also is a clear indication of objectification of immigrants in America.

Child adoption is another case where objectification is seen. A Muslim child is adopted by a Christian family by all means the child has to shed off the Christian beliefs, practices and culture and adopt the Christians, likewise to a Christian child adopted by a Muslim family. This happens against the victim's wishes or simply happens without much concern on the victim's feelings. I can argue that if this is a case of objectification, then it is right because the child who would otherwise be in the streets, or could be suffering in one way or another gets the basic human needs. On the contrary the adoptees are not keen on the child's feelings and interests.

In Susan Straight's book "Travels with My Ex," we see an element of racial prejudice. At the beginning it was not clear but as you read ahead, you clearly see an element of racial discrimination. The woman's husband was

grouped among those who committed serious crimes simply because the husband was a black person. This is another indication of objectification.

Conclusion

Objectification has diverse meanings. Some schools of thought, Luke Muehlhauser for instance, maintain that objectification refers to the act of treating others as a means to an end, without being keen on their goals feelings and preferences. With objectification, not only is vivid the fact that the overall change of culture will not solely be as a result of the actions of an individual, but also that the overall change in the culture is partly to blame due to an individual's actions. And the overall culture is to blame due to all of the individuals actions. This seems to me as an odd definition owing to the fact that it seems incomplete given that there are numerous cases that match the definition but which cannot be branded cases of objectification.

References

1. Frantz Fanon's " The Fact of Blackness" or Adrienne Rich " Women and Honor: Some Notes on Lying"
2. At least one of the following essays from the book The Best American Essays of 2011; " Rude Am i in My Speech" , " Travels with my Ex", What Killed Aiyanna Stanley-Jones", " Lucky Girl", " Magical Dinners", " Buddy Ebsen," or " Pearl Upward"
3. Two scholarly peer reviewed journal articles published since 2007, at least six pages long.
4. Two Op-Eds published since 2012 from at least different national newspapers: New York Times, La Times, Chicago Tribune, Wall street Journal,

Washington Post, or San Jose Mercury News.

5. One monograph, published since 1992

6. One topic oriented encyclopedia