

TO BE OR NOT TO BE POLITICALLY CORRECT

Jeong O Park and Denis-Mihai Covaci

Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Seoul, Korea, Technical University of Cluj-Napoca, North University Centre of Baia Mare Romania

Abstract: Political Correctness is a fluid concept, in a continuous development, which is also the reason that it makes so hard to define. Being so, a lot of people trying to answer if they are pro or against, if they have to be or not to be politically correct. This article makes a short research on different definitions and its links to the neo-Marxism ideas. Analyzing different examples, people may understand better if PC succeed to fulfill its purpose: diversity, tolerance, equality.

Keywords: political correctness, politically correct, political philosophy, neo-Marxism, diversity, tolerance, equality.

Political correctness is a concept with which both political thinkers and philosophers, as well as opinion-makers and those who engage in politics, operate. The relevance of the theme is given precisely by the social context in which we come to operate with it. Of course, we cannot claim that this concept is put into practice by all the actors in the political scene, and moreover we will see how some of them deny their existence, considering that the effects that are associated with political correctness (PC) are nothing but parts of an evolution of the systems that guide Western society.

People have selective memory. They tend to keep in mind what they find interesting or related to their concerns. You have probably heard in the training courses: "If from all that I said you would only remember so much, you will get the whole picture". This was the case with William Shakespeare's work as well. Despite the quality and novelty that his writings have brought to the universal literature, the echo around his work is heard in the distance, saying: To be or not to be?

Today we have to answer to a more difficult question than the one above: to be or not to be politically correct? Living in a world so sophisticated, a globalized world, where people from all parts of the planet meet and make business or just simply having interactions, you are forced to take a side in this matter of being or being not politically correct. And you do, even if you do not know that you do it. Because as we will see in the pages above, you can find examples of PC in your supermarket, in your favorite movie or in one of the most appreciated sport tournaments. When you buy from that specific shop, when

you watch that TV show or pay the ticket to that championship, you already are part of it. You may accept or you may not, but you already are in a context of PC. Thus, in other words the question above sounds like this: am I endorsing this PC behavior or I am rejecting it?

This article does not have the purpose to attack or to challenge any kind of progress. We are just asking if political correctness is exactly what it proclaims to be. Is it really the knight of the truth or like any ideology it protects just a specific target group, which makes it a social justice defender, neither a truth protector, nor a justice guardian.

1. Political correctness - short description

Writer William Lind sees *political correctness* as *America's new state ideology*¹. Only many times, *reality contradicts ideology*, and when this happens, *followers of the movement preach the prohibition of reality*².

The opinions are really divided. When you hear of political correctness, some think of George Orwell's book, *1984*, and the famous *Thought Police*. Others, like Michael William, are thinking of *a mechanism for the promotion and support of neo-Marxist ideology*.³

Whether we are talking about language, ideas, behavioral norms or values, political correctness has rethought what is acceptable and what is appropriate, relying on a sense of human obligation not to disturb one's neighbor.⁴ However, although it is liberal in its purposes, sanctifying language, thoughts and actions, creating a better place, free of skids, is illiberal in its practices, because it implies the establishment of a self-censorship to avoid possible conflicts.⁵ As a result, paradoxical situations such as positive discrimination arise.⁶

Those who apply this concept avoid the critical terms, replacing them with abstract euphemisms. For example, the phrase *drug addict* is replaced by the *substance addict*, *the blind person* becomes *visually impaired*, and the examples may continue.⁷

Political correctness is a fluid concept which develops day-to-day. This is exactly one of the biggest difficulty when someone tries to explain what political correctness

¹William S. Lind, „Introducere,” in William S. Lind et al (Coord., *Corectitudinea politică: „Religia” marxistă a noii ordini mondiale*), Bucharest: Editura Rost, 2015, 16.

²*Ibid*, 15.

³Michael William, *The Genesis of Political Correctness: The Basis of a False Morality*, iBooks, 2016, 38

⁴Geoffrey Hughes, *Political Correctness: A History of Semantics and Culture*, West Sussex: Blackwell Publishing, 2010, 4.

⁵*Ibid*.

⁶*Ibid*.

⁷*Ibid*, 14.

is. Although, some conclusions can be made. The first one reveals that PC encompasses the values adopted and supported by cultural Marxism. Whether we are talking about sexual liberalization, racial victimization, discrediting family, marriage, democracy, encouraging intolerance towards the white man, they are all well-built bricks on the foundation of political correctness. The second important observation is about its semantic research, because the concept being made up of two terms that are in some kind of contradiction. If by fairness we go rather with the mind to something good, which is honest, whole, irreproachable or true, joining the political term sends us to something contrary, because it refers to an area characterized by compromise, power games and lack of transparency.

Luigi Eposito, a sociology and criminology professor at Barry University, manages to capture almost all the attributes of the phenomenon:

"Although there is no unified or uncontested definition of PC, it is, in its most basic form, a set of linguistic norms, practices, and policies that seek to challenge the alienation and marginalization of socially and economically disadvantaged groups, which include poor people, women, racial and ethnic minorities, LGBTQ people, and the disabled. Since the 1990s, however, the term PC is typically associated with a type of leftist progressive puritanism that prevents people from speaking their minds and/or voicing uncomfortable truths that might "offend" members of marginalized groups/communities. [...] Critics contend it is the liberal-leftist orthodoxy associated with PC that has undercut the interests of traditional white, Western, Christian, heterosexual, working and middle-class people by preventing them from defending their own interests in the name of multiculturalism, equality, and social justice [...] Political correctness, according to its critics, has created an ultrarepressive social-political environment in which abstract ideals associated with diversity, equality, and social justice take precedence over truth, common sense, national interests, and even nature itself. "⁸

Many may dispute the relevant observations above. The interesting part is that it would not be a new thing. This concept creates a great deal of conflict, precisely because there is no unanimous agreement on its use and meaning. The political left condemns its use as a right-wing rant to discredit ideas, such as feminism, limiting majority tyranny, LGBT,

⁸ Luigi Eposito, "Understanding Political Correctness: History, Philosophy, and its Current Relevance in the Era of Trump", in Luigi Eposito and Laura Finley (Ed., *Political Correctness in the Era of Trump: Threat to Freedom or Ideological Scapegoat?*), Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2019, 1-3.

which is in clear contradiction with conservative values such as patriarchy, freedom of speech or traditional action or family.

Wherever we turn, political correctness seems to be a continuation of the war waged by economic Marxism over the current order, but using other means, this time the emphasis being on the cultural side. Being a fluid concept, constantly developing, similar to the world, which it wants to annihilate, instead of creating a new one in which capitalism is eradicated, Christianity is given to oblivion, and equality is achieved. To this end, the entire arsenal of the Frankfurt School has been theorized, the legalization of sexuality has fueled and fuels the current hedonism among the population, tolerance is preached, and people have to accept the abnormal as normal, marriages between men and women have become normal and within the community. LGBT, equality has been transformed into a goal, although the tyranny of the majority has been blamed, positive discrimination has been praised and encouraged. Meritocracy, as a fundamental element of choosing a person as the winner for a public position or a leadership position, has long since passed in the background, now the candidates must first respect the gender, ethnic, racial and the quotas of the people from a sexual minority.

The main reason why the citizen has to accept all these things is multiculturalism. However, although the citizen must accept all the cultural differences of the others, even if they conflict with his beliefs, traditional, conservative, Christian, he is subjected to social censorship. If he tries to combat this situation, he is accused of being retrograde, homophobic, Islamophobic or misogynistic. Tolerance is preached whenever neo-Marxist values are upheld, but it is abrogated when the other party wants to combat the socio-political reality proposed and applied by cultural Marxists.

The situation is problematic, because the progressives, who are pro PC, try to debate in a dichotomous way against the conservative side, who is against PC, in black and white story, without nuances, an antagonistic conflict, in which the good and the evil are fighting to win. The first of them are considered to represent the good and the white, because by their activity the discrimination of minorities has disappeared or will disappear, which will establish large-scale treacherous governance, which will allow the whole world to be equal. Although painted as the absolute evil in this confrontation, the Conservatives only draw attention to the fact that despite the goals proposed at the theoretical level, its application leads to other inequalities and discriminations on the majority population, but which are not

taken into account due to the fact that the neo-Marxists think that in order for the balance to be correct, the boards should not be equal, but inclined in favor of minorities which were discriminated for a long time before now. In other words, as long as the purpose of not harming the rights or interests of the target group of the political correctness, everything it is great because the purpose excuses the means. In every other context in which their goal was achieved, but minorities were harmed, the majority is labeled as politically incorrect or intolerant by reason of tyranny of the majority on the minority.

2. To be or not to be politically correct

As can be seen, each has theorized political correctness in a different way, although there are many common elements between the definitions given by the researchers of the phenomenon. It is interesting that each one emphasizes the respectable purpose of the concept, but it draws attention to the way to achieve it: tolerance through censorship, blurring of discrimination through positive discrimination, winning dissensions by using a double standard. The Frankfurt School encouraged the concept of victimization... any failure must be primarily discriminatory: racial, ethnic, gender, values. Discrimination against minorities is bad, neo-Marxists believe, but positive discrimination is good, because although it harms the interests of the majority, it benefits the minority. In other words, a thing, a value or an action is politically correct as long as the cause is served. Otherwise, she is repudiated as intolerant and unjust.

The members of the Frankfurt School concluded that economic Marxism failed because of the working class, which was too satisfied and accustomed to the world order, to unite with all the proletarians around the world to overthrow it. As a result, they shifted their attention from the hijacking of the bourgeois class to the destruction of Western values, which the world has remained as we have known it until now.

Thus, Geoffrey Hughes spoke about the fact that the neo-Marxists will try a redefinition of *norms, behaviors and language* in order to challenge the Western world, which has a white men orientation⁹. Even others surprised the fact that the *governments have to be tolerant with revolutionary minorities, but they are forbidden to tolerate the traditional*

⁹ Hughes, *op. cit.*, 38-40.

right¹⁰. Moreover, PC endorses the creation of *an ultra-repressive social-political environment* in order to have the truth losing the arguments over concepts as *diversity, equality and social justice*.¹¹ As a matter of fact, Raymond V. Raehn believes that *one of the purposes of PC is to overthrow the traditional culture in order to cause a social revolution as Marxism tried before it*.¹²

Unfortunately, as we will see in the next pages, it is a big difference between theory and practice. Even if political correctness is seen as an instrument fighting against injustice, day-to-day situations prove us the contrary. It is maintaining the injustice, but it is endorsing the underdogs. One of the biggest critics of the conservatives against PC is that in any matter we have the interests of people coming from risk category as women, people of color, members of LGBT community and so on interfering with the ones of men, white or straights, the first have to win the argument, the selection, the competition in light of the social injustices they have suffered, but this is not justice, this is social justice. Otherwise, PC will claim that the second discriminated them or endorsed the contest of discrimination in which the ancestors of the first lived. Sounds like an artificial conflict? Let's see what did Lidl before started to sell a specific Greek product, who will be the new James Bond, what happened with the Wimbledon tennis tournament and what those things have in common with political correctness.

Firstly, Lidl Company has removed the crosses from the towers of a Greek church for some products sold on the territory of Belgium, so that the population of Islamic religion is not offended. Specifically, their own products, tomato sausages, respectively vegetables and cheese fritters, packaged under the Eridanus brand, in a "Greek Original Product" campaign had on their packaging an image with a church from a pennant area of Greece: Santorini island.

A Belgian citizen, who realized that *the image was photoshopped, removing the crosses*, thus *erasing part of the Greek landscape and culture*, discovered the situation. The news site RTL.be, which gave the news about the unfortunate event of

¹⁰ Andrei Dîrlău, „Lukács & Școala de la Frankfurt: demolarea prin subversiune”, în William S. Lind et all (Coord., *Corectitudinea politică: „Religia” marxistă a noii ordini mondiale*), Bucharest: Editura Rost, 2015, 278-279.

¹¹ Eposito, *op. cit.*, 3.

¹² Raymond V. Raehn, „Rădăcinile istorice ale „corectitudinii politice.” in William S. Lind et all (Coord., *Corectitudinea politică: „Religia” marxistă a noii ordini mondiale*), Bucharest: Editura Rost, 2015, 27.

correction, *launched a survey, in which 90% of the respondents said they were against Lidl's way of acting.*¹³

The company that owns the *Lidl* brand, which *has about 10,000 supermarkets in more than 27 countries in Europe, has apologized for the adopted design and the possible damage created, promising that it will solve the situation quickly.* A company spokesman said that Lidl avoids the use of religious symbols in order not to exclude any religious faith. This approach of the German sales brand shows an example of PC, in which the truth has been relativized to respond to the neo-Marxist doctrine, which advocates for tolerance and multiculturalism, namely the defense of religious, ethnic, racial or gender minorities, but discriminates the Christian religion, who is majoritary in Europe, by removing the crosses, which are a key elements and symbols for Christians, and disregards the Greek, multisecular culture, removing pieces from the beautiful church of Santorini Island.

Secondly, a shock wave was triggered when the information appeared that in the James Bond movie, twenty fifth edition, main character with eponymous name will be taken out on the dead line, and code 007, through which the UK's external information service has empowered James Bond to operate missions on behalf of the country, will be taken over by a woman of color. According to sources, *James Bond remains James Bond, but he retired to Jamaica, and his place in MI6 is taken by Lashana Lynch, known for her role as Maria Rambeau in Captain Marvel.*¹⁴ *De jure*, James Bond remains in the series, but is removed on the dead line. *De facto*, Lashana Lynch takes over all the prerogatives of old 007, becoming the main character of the production, the new savior of the British Crown, the person to whom all eyes will turn. The information that a female character took over Bond came one year after *Barbara Broccoli, the film's executive producer, stated that: "James Bond will never be a woman, because he is a male character, so it has been thought of and probably so it is with you [...] It is normal. We don't have to change all male characters into female characters."*¹⁵

¹³ RTL.be, "Retrait des croix du paysage grec sur ses emballages: Lidl présente ses excuses aux personnes qui ont pu être choquées," Rtl.be, Accessed February 5, 2020, <https://www.rtl.be/info/vous/temoignages/antoine-est-scandalise-lidl-a-retire-les-croix-du-paysage-grec-sur-ses-emballages-948607.aspx>.

¹⁴ Steph Harmon, „Bond's number is up: black female actor <<is the new 007>>,” The Guardian, Accessed February 6, 2020, <https://www.theguardian.com/film/2019/jul/15/lashana-lynch-new-007-james-bond-daniel-craig>.

¹⁵ Catherine Shoard, „A female James Bond? Never, confirms executive producer,” The Guardian, Accessed February 6, 2020, <https://www.theguardian.com/film/2019/jul/15/lashana-lynch-new-007-james-bond-daniel-craig>.

The news was received with a wave of critics, various people declaring themselves dissatisfied with the fact that functional things, which brought emotion into people's souls, are today transformed, for socio-political reasons, to respond to concepts such as multiculturalism or feminism. The current tendency is to correct reality by either eliminating from a public sphere a concept (an artistic work, a traditional value, a personality that does not correspond to the non-Marxist ideology), or by replacing it with another, which corresponds to the principles of political correctness, that is influenced by feminism, multiculturalism, relativism, matriarchal culture, liberalization of sexuality and by encouraging attention for LGBT people.

To sum up, journalist Arthur Chrenkoff was disappointed that *these works of the genre, sexuality or ethnicity of the protagonist of an artistic work are done for the sake of diversity, because instead of replacing the archetype of a powerful man penned by a British author in the 1940s, the class modern creation should create something new based on the values they follow.*¹⁶ In this perspective, In the same tone, Yaphet Kotto, the first actor who played the role of the villain in the James Bond series, said that *this film must be literally correct, that is to correspond to Ian Fleming's novels, in which 007 was a white character, not politically correct.*¹⁷

Thirdly, when the organizers of the Wimbledon tennis tournament decided that the prizes of the athletes would be equal regardless of the sex of the players, a real scandal ensued. Proponents of change have argued that, while respecting the principle of equity and equality, men and women should be equally renowned for winning the same prize. The difference was not huge, *a female player received 95% of the earnings of a male player.*¹⁸ When those who marched to prevent this change from happening, they were attacked as misogynists, adherents of the patriarchal society. However, if we were to listen to their arguments, they would say, among other things, that men have a larger television audience, as well as a greater physical effort, respectively, that they put more effort (they play three of the best five sets compared to two of the best 3 sets in the case of ladies). The arguments and the

¹⁶ Arthur Chrenkoff Meet, „007's most fearsome enemy: a politically correct lack of imagination,” Spectator.com.au, Accessed February 6, 2020, <https://www.spectator.com.au/2019/07/meet-007s-most-fearsome-enemy-a-politically-correct-lack-of-imagination/>.

¹⁷ Jess Denham, „James Bond should not be black, says first black Bond villain Yaphet Kotto,” The Independent, Accessed February 6, 2020, <https://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/films/news/james-bond-should-not-be-black-says-first-black-bond-villain-yaphet-kotto-10164749.html>.

¹⁸ Christopher Clarey, „Wimbledon to Pay Women and Men Equal Prize Money,” New York Times, Accessed February 7, 2020, <https://www.nytimes.com/2007/02/22/sports/tennis/23cnd-tennis.html>.

debate did not matter; the Wimbledon tennis tournament also adopted the system of prize parity just as it happened in 1973 with the US Open, in 2001 in the case of the Australian Open, respectively the French Open in 2006.¹⁹

The situation above was not in the media's interest to be shared and presented, because it was not in accordance with the new feminist principles: gender equity. The Serbian athlete Novak Djokovic's was against this change, but because of the public opinion's reaction, he had to give up.

The change did not have the intention to provide a balance, because you cannot preach equality when you take a weight from the left side and put the right one, the instability being just moved from one side to another. Is there a fairer solution? Yes, for example, each player, regardless of gender, will be rewarded with the same amount for each set played. Thus, no gender was discriminated, because they all received the same money per set, except that those who played more, in this case men, who play even five sets, which means more hours of broadcasting, so even more ads, would have been rewarded with a higher amount.

3. Conclusions

To be or not to be politically correct is a hard question to answer. Theoretical, it sounds amazing to eradicate discrimination and to endorse a world where everywhere has equal chances to succeed, things that PC preaches to defend. Practically, as we could see, things are different, because sometimes PC looks more like censorship and social justice than truth or purely justice. Even if it says that is fighting for toleration, it looks intolerant with the one whose interests are in contradiction with the one it is defending it. So it would be better to say that it has a partisan toleration, as it happened in the Lidl case, where in the name of religious toleration we had an action of intolerance against Christianity. Similarly, changing the main character who was a male for 24 editions of the James Bond movie with a female does not seem to be justice, but more like an intrusion in the name of diversity, social justice and gender equity in the process of the movie characters distribution. Moreover, even PC tries to look like a knight who fights against discrimination, we can see that it just changed the sides of this matter, because eradicating discrimination does not mean to stop discriminating the discriminated ones and to start discriminating the discriminators instead.

¹⁹ Charlotte Edmond, „How women won the fight for equal prize money at Wimbledon,” World Economic Forum, Accessed February 7, 2020, <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2017/07/wimbledon-women-equal-prize-money/>.

You cannot stop discrimination with more discrimination or with another kind of it, as fighting for same wage regardless of gender, but advocating that men to be paid the same as women even if they playing more sets than them.

Looking at our 3 examples from above, PC is nothing more than the process of enforcing, forced and unintentional, the principles set out in the non-Marxist ideology on today's society, marching on the modification of traditional elements popular within the communities. Thus, we try to either eliminate these elements from the public space or empty their content. In the case of the packages for Eridanus products, Lidl intervened on the architecture of Greek tourist and religious objectives, eliminating all the crucibles on the tower of the church in Santorini, under the pretext of not discriminating against any person of any religious domination, omitting, in a manner, a factual and empirical truth by the deletion of Christian symbols, frequent in that area, for the presentation of a campaign, paradoxically, dedicated to an "Original Greek Product". Coincidentally or not, this action seems to have been inspired even by the first writings of the neo-Marxists, who put the failure of the revolution evoked by Marx on the popularity of Christian values among the proletarians. Moreover, the elimination of the crosses, a key symbol of Christianity, because Jesus died on a cross, transforms the church into a simple meeting room, emptied of content and significance.

The replacement of white actors with some of color, some male with some female, some heterosexual with some homosexual, in some film productions, which were written and designed for the first category, just for the sake of it to respond to the demands of a socio-political doctrine, arouse indignation and encourage discrimination, because they face a reality consolidated for decades: James Bond is a spy, white, gallant, British, heterosexual, seductive, a Don Juan wanted by all ladies, who manages to save the situation every time. Even if you do not believe in PC, you will difficulty find other reasons to justify those changes rather than the one above.

Even though, using a color woman instead of the classic James Bond it is a declaration that world changed and United Kingdom changed, because nowadays, due to multiculturalism, you can find on the streets of London people from all parts despite the 1940s when the population was more homogeneous, using a woman instead of the original script shows us that the actual producers are more interested in endorsing a political perspective of reality than to continue and develop the original script in the way the author

wrote it for the first time. It would have been a better to keep this movie as it was designed, because first of all you cannot destroy something valuable just because it did not support a specific ideology.

Regarding the Wimbledon tournament, some said that by making possible the parity of the prizes for both women and men, the equality was achieved. It was not, because women play just 3 sets instead of 5 sets as men do. Thus, men are paid the same amount of money, even if they stay on the field and play more sets in order win the Wimbledon. In capitalism, the one who produces more money is paid better than the similar person, man or woman, who does not have the same results. A man should be rewarded after his or her productivity not by his religion affiliation, gender, race or color.

In conclusion, to be or not to be politically correct it is not a question about being or not being tolerant. It is a question about being part of an ideology, because as it was shown, PC looks more as an implementation instrument for social justice and partisan toleration in order to achieve diversity, wage gender parity or equality. Unfortunately, even if the theory sounds good, in practice it will be significance difference between its purposes and its results. Like any ideology it protects just a specific target group, which makes it subjective, not objective, a partisan instrument of an ideology, but neither a truth protector, nor a justice guardian. Today, to be politically correct is seen in a pejorative way.

References

Primary sources:

1. Dîrlău, Andrei, "Lukács & Școala de la Frankfurt: demolarea prin subversiune", in William S. Lind et all (Coord., *Corectitudinea politică: „Religia” marxistă a noii ordini mondiale*). Bucharest: Editura Rost, 2015.
2. Eposito, Luigi, "Understanding Political Correctness: History, Philosophy, and its Current Relevance in the Era of Trump", in Luigi Eposito and Laura Finley (Ed., *Political Correctness in the Era of Trump: Threat to Freedom or Ideological Scapegoat?*), Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2019.
3. Hughes, Geoffrey, *Political Correctness: A History of Semantics and Culture*, West Sussex: Blackwell Publishing, 2010.

4. Lind, William S., "Introducere." in William S. Lind et all (Coord., *Corectitudinea politică: „Religia” marxistă a noii ordini mondiale*), Bucharest: Editura Rost, 2015.
5. Raehn, Raymond V., "Rădăcinile istorice ale „corectitudinii politice.” in William S. Lind et all (Coord., *Corectitudinea politică: „Religia” marxistă a noii ordini mondiale*), Bucharest: Editura Rost, 2015.
6. William, Michael, *The Genesis of Political Correctness: The Basis of a False Morality*, iBooks, 2016.

Secondary sources:

1. Shoard, Catherine. "A female James Bond? Never, confirms executive producer." *The Guardian*. Accessed February 5, 2020. <https://www.theguardian.com/film/2018/oct/05/there-will-never-be-a-female-james-bond-confirms-executive-producer>.
1. Chrenkoff Meet, Arthur. "007's most fearsome enemy: a politically correct lack of imagination." *Spectator.com.au*. Accessed February 6, 2020. <https://www.spectator.com.au/2019/07/meet-007s-most-fearsome-enemy-a-politically-correct-lack-of-imagination/>.
2. Denham, Jess. "James Bond should not be black, says first black Bond villain Yaphet Kotto." *The Independent*. Accessed February 6, 2020. <https://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/films/news/james-bond-should-not-be-black-says-first-black-bond-villain-yaphet-kotto-10164749.html>.
3. Clarey, Christopher. "Wimbledon to Pay Women and Men Equal Prize Money." *New York Times*. Accessed February 7, 2020. <https://www.nytimes.com/2007/02/22/sports/tennis/23cnd-tennis.html>.
4. Edmond, Charlotte. "How women won the fight for equal prize money at Wimbledon." *World Economic Forum*, Accessed February 7, 2020. <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2017/07/wimbledon-women-equal-prize-money/>.