

On being “Politically Correct”

Thomas R. Cuba

2011 0408

I’m not sure where this term comes from, but it crept into the language over the past 30 or 40 years. Either that or I just wasn’t paying that much attention before then. But I’ve decided that I don’t like it.

Well, I don’t like it as it stands right now.

Why? Because right now it means that a very small percentage of the population or a small interest group gets to overwhelm the interests of the others. I can see where the term might have originated in our need to be sensitive to the smaller groups and not discount their needs or opinions completely. I support that totally. In another essay I point out that a good representative is elected by SOME of the people to represent ALL of the people. So this makes sense. The small groups need to be heard and respected.

But when did it come about that the small group needs should become dominant over those of the greater group? I don’t think I need to get into specific examples. I just want to remind people that the voice of the larger group deserves the same respect and needs to be listened to just as much as the voice of the small group.

This is tricky, or it can be if the press gets onto it and calls me a politically incorrect name or something, but it can be done.

As an aside, it is worth noting that these little groups are ones we invented anyway. Remember, I am by trade a biologist and sometimes I look at things like a biologist might. Now, as a biologist I know we are all the same as members of the genus, *Homo sapiens*, but I also know that there are differences, such as in hair color for example. Just like there are biologists who would put the Colorado mountain lion in a different species from the Florida panther and those who would call them the same, there are people who would divide us humans into groups.¹

I submit that these divisions are rather arbitrary, and who we are depends on how you slice it. We can all be one group, as was the view of the Messiah and the Doctor.² Or we can all be sliced up into pieces starting with obvious, if artificial differences, like skin color or language of origin. The trick is when to stop slicing. For example, why are Irish Americans not considered a minority? For myself, I belong to a relatively small portion of the population of Czech origin. Would anyone know the difference between a Serb and a Croat if they met them in Wal-Mart?

¹ This is an actual biological argument. The two populations are geographically separated, but can and do interbreed successfully when put together such as in a zoo.

² Dr. Martin L. King

Who is the guy who decided this group would be a minority and that group would just be lumped in with the rest and called part of the majority? It's all just stupid, but it's all astute at the same time. By being called out from the majority, one group obtains political standing and it becomes politically correct for politicians to pay more attention to that group than the other guys.

Well, I guess I'm a lumper and I see more similarities among us than differences. That is not to imply that there are not sociological differences. I just pointed out that there are differences. What I am saying is that, like the Doctor said, there should not be.

How to finish this? We should cherish our differences and draw strength from our cultural diversity, but these differences should not be used for political gain. That would be "politically incorrect."

We are Americans. We are One.