

To the Victim Goes the Spoils! **by Fred DeRuvo – Study-Grow-Know Ministries**

Political correctness is a fascinating subject if for no other reason than the fact that an entire society of people can fall prey to the warped, restrictive, racist, guilt-creating, ad hominem-based, and overwhelmingly antithetical ideology of it. They do so all because they allow emotion to dictate to them in the decision-making process.

Even though many would argue against the fact that political correctness is a form of cultural Marxism, we need look no further than the most basic definition provided by Anthony Browne in his book *The Retreat of Reason*.

“At its most fundamental, political correctness seeks to redistribute power from the powerful to the powerless. At its most crude, it opposes power for the sake of opposing power, making no moral distinction between whether the powerful exercise their power in a way that can be rationally and reasonably justified.”¹

Therein lies not only the *problem* with political correctness, but the *connection* it has to Marxism itself. For political correctness to work and actually *redesign* society, it must be able to separate people and groups into “victims” and “aggressors.” Anyone who is *not* perceived as a victim (or *in sympathy* with them) is seen as the *aggressor* in a battle *against* the victim. Those are the only two real categories of society that political correctness can and does recognize: *victims* and *aggressors*.

This is why the Left is so visceral in its condemnation of anyone who is *not* part of the Left. They believe they are fighting for the true victims in society against those on the Right, whom they classify as *aggressors*.

As Browne states, *“political correctness automatically supports the weak and vulnerable, classifying them as nearly untouchable victims, irrespective of whether they merit such support or not. When the successful, affluent, powerful Dutch film maker Theo van Gogh was ritually murdered in the streets of Amsterdam for insulting Islam, the politically correct, including the Guardian and Index on Censorship, automatically sided with the comparatively powerless Islamic Dutch-Moroccan killer.”²*

The basis for deciding on a course of action as far as who to support is *not* based on *reason* or even *merit* but on emotion or virtue. For instance, anyone who is a capitalist is seen as the *aggressor* (regardless how many jobs they provide). This explains why people like Mi-

¹ Anthony Browne, *The Retreat of Reason* (2006), p. 9

² Anthony Browne, *The Retreat of Reason* (2006), p. 10

Michael Moore are desperate to be seen as part of the victim group, in spite of the fact that his net worth of \$50 million dollars obviously places him far above true victims.

As long as Michael Moore continues to portray himself as the victim of the capitalistic elite, he will continue to be seen as a victim. This is in spite of the truth that he is a capitalist who has amassed more money than most of us would realize in ten lifetimes. Since he is seen as a victim, he can say what he says against the “aggressors” and whether his words are true or not, they are accepted as true because of his victimhood status.

It used to surprise and anger me when the media would stop broadcasting some very important piece of news in favor of something else. This occurred, for instance, just as the issue of Benghazi was gaining momentum and it appeared that it might create problems for the Obama administration. But what happened? Hurricane Sandy hit the shore and devastated entire neighborhoods, leaving people without homes and the basic necessities in life. The media was able to switch gears from the Benghazi situation to focus almost entirely on Hurricane Sandy's devastation. This also allowed Mr. Obama – through various photo ops – to look like a leader. Was Hurricane Sandy important to cover? Of course, and the damage it caused still exists.

But why was it covered to the exclusion of Benghazi? Obviously, it had to do with perceived victims, didn't it? Benghazi, at its root, is about a nearly-Third World country and the big “aggressor” of the United States. Yes, a handful of Americans were killed. So what? Why were we there anyway, many would ask? The attitude that you “get what you deserve” is the natural response of the politically correct after determining the victim from the aggressor.

So, it was easy for the media to begin focusing on victims of the weather and leave their coverage of Benghazi behind. After a number of days or a few weeks, things settled down and the media was then able to simply segue into focusing on other things and felt no obligation to return to the issue of Benghazi. They also stopped focusing on the effects of Hurricane Sandy, in spite of the fact that neighborhoods continued to exist under the devastation of the hurricane, supplies did not get where they were supposed to be, and in general, people continued to suffer for some time.

What the media could have and should have done was to focus on Hurricane Sandy while continuing coverage of Benghazi. However, even when Benghazi was being covered by the press, it wasn't being covered in an honest manner. Even though four Americans died in Benghazi, the Obama administration was seen as the real “victim” with the “aggressive” press (allegedly backed by the GOP) doing what it could to take down the administration. More than a few people claimed the whole attack on the Obama administration was nothing more than an attempt at political gain from the GOP. In the end, Benghazi, for many people, has nothing to do with right or wrong but how people feel about who is the

real victim in the situation. For them, the GOP is the aggressor and the Obama administration is the victim; therefore, the Obama administration needs to be “protected.” End of story.

This resolute need or insistence to support the victim while vociferously denouncing the aggressor is a staple of the politically correct system. *“Automatically opposing the powerful and supporting the powerless means that, when presented with a new issue, the politically correct must decide not what is right or wrong, malign or benign, true or untrue, but who is the more powerful and who the less powerful. The PC analytical process enjoys the beauty of simplicity:*

- *Identify the victim.*
- *Support them and their interests, irrespective of any other factors.”*³

The idiocy of this belief system results in the fact, as Browne states, that *“victims are supported not because they are right but because they are vulnerable”*⁴ and when anyone takes the time to apply critical analysis to the alleged victim's situation, they are quickly seen as the aggressor because of it, even if their analysis is right on the mark. This “aggression” toward victims is seen as oppression and must be opposed.

You see, this is one of the largest reasons why I have a difficulty with people on the Left who say they are Christian. If they support and align themselves with unwritten policy and code created by political correctness, they are not aligning themselves with truth at all. They are aligning themselves with something that merely appears to be truth, though as we have seen, it really bears no resemblance to truth – biblical truth. Therein lies the problem. Those who have bought into the politically correct movement wind up essentially ignoring the truth of Scripture. They do this because, within politically correct circles, truth is not based on reason, but on emotional virtue.

Ultimately, political correctness is predicated upon the false notion of how to determine the “victim” from the “aggressor.” It is done through an emotional resonance within them, which translates to their truth.

As opposed to this, the Bible contains God's absolute truth and it is non-negotiable. We are to follow it whether our emotions go along with us or not. This is exactly what Jesus did. He followed the Father's truth to the core, regardless of how He may have felt about a situation. Look no further than the Garden of Gethsemane as a perfect illustration.

Emotions are difficult to live with and we tend to follow their dictates in spite of the lack of reason. Browne notes, *“One of the ironies of political correctness is that, since it subjugates*

³ Anthony Browne, *The Retreat of Reason* (2006), p. 11

⁴ *Ibid*, p. 13

objective truth to subjective virtue, it often causes more harm than good...the world is not short of good intentions, but it is too often short of good reasoning.”⁵

For instance, double standards exist as part of the fabric of society and are acceptable only if the “victims” gain from it. The double standard should always favor the victim, not the aggressor. It does not matter that those who are seen as “aggressors” are discriminated against because of it.

A woman is essentially given the right to abort the unborn child she carries and can do so without obtaining her partner's permission. Many would say that this is as it should be because a woman should have control over her own body. (A woman who is denied an abortion is the “victim” even though her intent is to victimize her unborn child. Political correctness, instead of being at odds with this truth, simply redefines things and the unborn child is declared “fetal tissue,” which removes personhood.)

But consider the fact that a married man who opts for a vasectomy cannot obtain one unless he gains written consent from his wife. On one hand, society says that a woman has complete and final control over her body, even when she is carrying another human being. On the other hand, a man who simply wants to become clinically “sterile” so that he cannot father another child cannot do so without permission of his wife. This is a clearly a double standard that is acceptable in society because the man is seen as the “aggressor” while the woman is seen as the “victim.” However, in this case, the man is victimized because of the double standard that is inherent in both situations, the abortion and the vasectomy.

Political correctness has really been around since the fall of humanity. It was clearly present in the Garden of Eden when the Tempter provided a relative version of “truth” that made both Eve and Adam feel as though they were somehow the “victims” against God, the “Aggressor.”

Because of his ability to make our first two parents see themselves as “victims” of God's “lordship” (aggression), Satan successfully caused them to listen to and obey their emotion, which determined truth for them. Because of it, the fall occurred, and with it the unnatural desire to look to emotion as the arbiter of truth. This is political correctness. It believes the lie because it feels right, not because it is right.

This is the crux of the problem, the very heart of the issue. Political correctness is built on a lie, a lie that says truth is determined by the way our emotions react to something. God says He is Truth and if we learn from Him, we will come to understand that truth is not de-

⁵ Anthony Browne, *The Retreat of Reason* (2006), p. 15

terminated by our emotions. Absolute truth has everything to do with God's immutable standards.

As we progress toward the end of the age, more and more people in society will turn from those immutable standards to follow a path of relativism, which leads to spiritual in. They will do so gladly because they will thoroughly come to believe that they have found the far better way: truth determined by virtue. The end of that path, unfortunately, leads to hell. I pray you're not on it.