

Word Definitions, Political Correctness and Emotional Arguments

The Intellectual Property of [John Marsing](http://www.MyHebrewBible.Com) - www.MyHebrewBible.Com

Contents

Introductory Thoughts.....	2
Political Observation.....	2
Hebrew Thinking	2
devar.....	2
Seeking Truth.....	2
Nothing new under the Sun.....	2
Decoupling the Message	2
Political Correctness	3
Word list.....	4
Propaganda.....	4
Democracy	4
Government	4
Secular	4
Religion.....	4
Dogma.....	4
Privilege	5
Fear - Revere.....	5
Law (Torah)	5
Rights.....	5
Citizen (United States).....	5
Constitution.....	5
Credit	5
Servant (i.e. Bond Servant).....	5
Master	5
Intellectual	5
Proselytizes	5
Welfare.....	5
Conclusion	7

Introductory Thoughts

Critical Thinking is thinking logical with a set of rules that are conducive to clarity. This article is critique of those who would submit an argument of which some or all is based on an emotional plea. People say on the one hand “I hate labels” i.e. words and on the other hand make arguments based on their emotional reaction to a word.

Political Observation

- I contend that this is what the political left does all the time e.g. progressive, fascist (see [Liberal Fascism by Jonah Goldberg](#)). The left goes through words like I go through underwear. Dennis Prager view of the left is that they base their arguments on emotion.
- What the right does is avoid the problem by avoiding words all together...as my definition of conservatism is that it's simply anti-left.

Hebrew Thinking

devar

It seems to me that definitions in Hebrew are not clear cut and they have some nuance which is to say they are dependent on context. When talking about the Hebrew word *debar*, Brad Scott likes to say the pun “words mean things”. It's a pun because *debar* means words and it means things. Another spin on this concept is to say that “words mean *different* things *dependent on context*”. My point here is that it's short sided to “for example cast out a word never to be used again or you will be chastised” because someone had a bad emotional experience that he has affixed to that word.

Seeking Truth

Is not the goal of an argument is to seek truth (I mean some people will even pay money to get their fix for an argument see [Monty Python Argument Sketch](#)). The art of Hebrew thinking is the joy of the give and take as one goes down (*Halacha's*) the path to acquire more truth.

Nothing new under the Sun

Decoupling the Message

Emotional arguments can come emanate from the arguer personally or can come from the arguer's perception of how others might react to various words. Let's say for the sake of argument (pun) that the arguer isn't personally emotionally “hung up” on a word, but avoids it's use because he believes his audience can't handle the use of the word that would otherwise perfectly articulate his point. See [Jonah and Delivering a Message - the case for indifference](#), as this article brings out the cost of making an emotional argument.

Political Correctness

What is it that drives PC? Surely a whole swath of people in this country who have succumb to this disease of the mind can't be because of some grandiose conspiracy? Just saying the words "political correctness" and it's enforcer the "thought police" reeks of anti-intellectualism. This brain dead silliness should cause anyone pause when they make an argument that could reasonably be associated with being politically correct.

This Orwellian double speak is a phenomenon that comes from the left. As Dennis Prager points out that being on the left means you never have to apologize. This is because the left doesn't think logically with their brain but rather emotionally with their heart. The consequences of their argument are simply irrelevant what matters is they felt good emotionally when they made the argument. It doesn't take much imagination to realize that this is disastrous because, for one thing, there is no accountability.

My point is that Orwellian double speak is abusing the clear definitions of words because they conjure a negative emotional reaction. The lack of clarity is the cost paid by the emotional arguer for not using a word whose definition would be perfect for the point being made.

I said that PC was born out of the political left, but are there people on the right who have come to the same disease? Note that I'm casting things in political terms, but applies to things religious. I say yes and I hope that my allies on the right will take this document to heart and cure themselves and/or inoculate themselves from the PC disease.

Word list

Going over this list reminds me of the concept that I thought up and which always cracks me up when I say it to myself. when I imagine running for political office my slogan would be “you must vote for me as I’m pro good things and anti-bad things”.

Propaganda

This has baggage that goes back to the Catholic Church and the bully pulpit and the ministries of propaganda like in Nazi Germany and in Imperial Japan. The word broken down means a position that one wishes to make does so my propping it up with argument (facts, figures, testimony etc.). So why is this necessarily bad?

Everybody is trying to sell you something (even God?) the question is do you need to be buying it.

Democracy

Do a search for “Notes on Nehemia Gordon’s Presentation”

Government

The patriot types go ballistic over this word. The etymology of this word the concept of what controls (governs) ones mind (ment). If I’m Torah observant and therefore the Word of Elohim is what controls my mind and further the country I live in creates a government that supports that notion then what’s the problem? I content that people blur the lines between the government as defined in the Constitution

Secular

“bad” word. Secular is amoral so there is no way it can be bad (or good for that matter as this is nirvana for the left). Secular is the place (world) that man finds himself.

Religion

get the legal definition and compare this with my SHRB&C strategy

James 1:26-27 KJV If any man among you seem to be religious,^{G2357} and bridleth not his tongue, but deceiveth his own heart, this man's religion^{G2356} is vain. ²⁷ Pure religion^{G2356} and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, *and* to keep himself unspotted from the world.

If I say “I’m not religious” because that’s a bad word, then I can’t make a criticism of those religions I object to. My religion is defined by my covenant with the Elohim of Israel and this Judeo-Christian religion is unique because it is the only one that has a contract with the Creator of the Universe. I’m critical of Islam because there is not contract with its god. In contrast the god of socialism does have a contract with many people which is in conflict and contrary to their contract with the El of the bible.

The point is can’t articulate who and what I am by being PC on the Right as this prevents me from expressing the most important thing one has...to have under contract the Creator of the Universe, the Elohim of Israel.

See “Word Study Religion G2356 threskeia, G2357 threskos”, <http://myhebrewbible.com/Article/283>

Dogma

Act 16:4 (Good); Luk 2:1(Not so Good); Act 17:7(Not so Good) ^a

^a See Word-Study-G1378-dogma-decree-ordinance-G1380-dokeo-to-think-be-accounted, article #[557](#)

Privilege

A privilege is (bad) in contrast to a right which is always “good”. As I studied the word privilege (bad), it has a meaning similar to rights.

Fear - Revere

Do I should I ever flat out fear God, or should I always simply ‘revere’ Him? When I’m making my SHRB&C argument in a court of law and the Judge ain’t getting it, my ultimate argument is to put the FEAR of GOD into him, not the revere of god into him.

Law (Torah)

I could talk all day about this.

Rights..

This

Citizen (United States)

Did you know there is a definition of this in the IRC which is radically different from the definition found in Title 5 which is about passports? As a general rule I am going to avoid the label like the plague but comparing these two definitions is interesting. By the way, what’s wrong with calling yourself a “Citizen of the Kingdom of Israel in exile” ?

Constitution

A constitutor is one who passes his debt on to the other.

Credit

Having good credit (good?) simply means that you have the capacity to go into debt. A corporation is the one that has the credit not you.

Servant (i.e. Bond Servant)

...

Master

....

Intellectual

See the article I started regarding the remarks of Rico Cortes which was about [scholars](#).

Proselytizes

....

Welfare

Faith to me is the answer to the question “do you actually believe that YHVH will do what YHVH said he will do when he took up the office of Elohim for Israel, i.e. that He will bless you (welfare) and protect you? If I’m receiving blessings from YHVH isn’t his intent that my way through life will **fare well**? Pure [religion](#) (another word on the list) is “To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, *and* to keep himself unspotted from the world”. With FDR’s New Deal we had started the process of delegating this responsibility to the public contrary to what scriptures says which was to keep it in the private. My point is when people think of welfare, they think of the public government welfare state and all the bad things it has produced (which are many) but, for whatever reason (like being irresponsible) they don’t associate this term with receiving welfare from YHVH and giving to those in need (as defined in Scripture). Therefore most people always put this word in the bad column.

more words...

Conclusion

If a point is worth making then it would be presumptuous of me (the receptor of the argument) to assume that it has no value.

If you're making an emotional argument you are ineffective "propagating" your point.

ToDo: cleanup these deletions

deletions

This brain dead silliness should cause anyone pause when they make an argument that could reasonably be accused of making a PC point.

This brain dead silliness should cause anyone pause when they make an argument that could reasonably be associated with being politically correct.

This brain dead silliness, which is a phenomenon that comes from the left, should cause anyone pause who could reasonably be accused of making a PC point.

My point is that Orwellian double speak is abusing the clear definitions of words which causes some people to throw these words in the trash because those words in the mind of an emotional thinker conjures up at some level a negative reaction.

My point is that Orwellian double speak is abusing the clear definitions of words which causes some people to throw these words in the trash because they conjure a negative emotional reaction.

My point is that Orwellian double speak is abusing the clear definitions of words because they conjure a negative emotional reaction.

So rather than using a word to describe that would be a perfect fit for the emotional arguer misses an opportunity for clarity

So rather than using a word whose definition would be perfect for the point being made the emotional arguer misses an opportunity for clarity

The cost of not using a word whose definition would be perfect for the point being made is the lack of clarity.

The lack of clarity is the cost of not using a word whose definition would be perfect for the point being.

The lack of clarity is the cost paid by the emotional arguer for not using a word whose definition would be perfect for the point being.