



Clanking Chains: Verbal Inflation in English Dictionaries; Reactionaries v. Revolutionaries: Feminists v. the Military, Hootie's Counterpunch

Jewell, Elizabeth J. and Frank Abate (eds.). *The New Oxford American Dictionary*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 1416:

react. Behave in a particular way in response to something.

- **(react against)** Respond with hostility, opposition, or a contrary course of action.
- **(reactions)** Opposition to political or social progress or reform.

reactionary. A person or set of views opposing political or social liberalization or reform.

These definitions assign the attitude of “hostility” to those who oppose “social progress” and “social liberalization,” a characterization not found in earlier dictionaries. Here are some examples:

Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary. (Springfield: G. & C. Merriam Co., Publishers, 1958), 703:

reaction. A counter tendency, esp., in politics, a movement towards a former political or social policy.

reactionary. Favoring reaction, or a return to an older order.

Oxford English Dictionary. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971), 2:2426:

reaction. A movement towards the reversal of an existing tendency or state of things, esp., in politics; a return, or a desire to return, to a previous condition of affairs.

reactionary. Characterized by reaction.

This last set of definitions is from Britain in 1971. That same year an American dictionary contained a far more slanted view in its definitions:

Morris, William (ed.). *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*. (New York: American heritage Publishing Co., 1971), 1085):

reaction. A tendency to revert to a former state. Opposition to progress or liberalism.

reactionary. Characterized by reaction; especially, opposing progress or liberalism. Also **reactionist.** An opponent of progress or liberalism.

Webster's adds a little more spin in its 1986 edition.

Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary. (Springfield: Merriam-Webster, Publishers, 1986), 979:

reaction. Resistance or opposition to a force, influence, or movement, esp: tendency toward a former and usually outmoded political or social order or policy.

reactionary. Marked by or favoring reaction; esp: ultraconservative in politics.



Observe the evolution of the definitions. In *Webster's* '58 and *Oxford*, '71 we find "movement towards" and "return to" a "previous condition." But also in 1971, the *American Heritage* adds "opposition to" and "opponent of" "progress." By 1986, *Webster's* had added "resistance to" an "outmoded political or social order" by "ultraconservatives." *Webster's Tenth*, published in 1998, retains the same definitions.

But as we move into the twenty-first century we find that *The New Oxford American Dictionary* continues the "verbal inflation" by adding the word "hostility" to those who "oppose social progress." Returning now to Kohl:

If change is partial and occurs through the channels of power considered legitimate in the status quo, it is called **reform**. Reform adds to the current arrangements or modifies them but it does not attempt to create a new order.

Change is **radical** when it involves new power relationships that are fundamentally different from those under the status quo. (p. 158)

Let me give an example. An illustration of reform would be the decision to allow women to join the military as equals to the men. Radical change occurred when it was discovered they could not compete physically and the training standards were lowered to meet their capabilities while the men's performances were handicapped to achieve an equal result.

Radical change can take place over a period of time, or it can happen suddenly. When radical change takes place suddenly and power relationships change practically overnight, such change is called **revolutionary**. (pp. 158-59)

An example of radical change on a revolutionary level was the admission of women at VMI and The Citadel. The military has always had women serving in various support functions and properly so. The fact that women entered into combat training along side men was simply a reform of the status quo. To change the rules of the game once the physical imbalance was recognized was radical. But the decision to force collegiate military academies to convert overnight into co-ed institutions was revolutionary. Neither VMI nor The Citadel can survive as they were originally conceived.

Observation: It is proper and expected of those who serve in the military to instantly orient to civilian authority and conscientiously accept the challenge to orient to the wishes their civilian leaders often impose instantly. But the military man is also sworn to defend the Constitution against all enemies both foreign and domestic. There are certain things that honorable men should not do. Among them are (1) accepting command of admitted homosexuals among his troops and (2) accepting command of women in combat training. Massive resignations throughout the entire officer corps of every branch of the military would have prevented these things from happening. The Marines stood firm and won. The rest could have done the same. As for the case of VMI and The Citadel, in my opinion they both should have turned off the lights, bolted their doors, and gone out with honor.

One man who has recently had the courage to take a stand against the feminists is Hootie Johnson. His "counterpunch" is the subject of a recent column by:

Schlaflly, Phyllis. "Hooray for Hootie." *Eagle Forum*, 11 Sept 2002, 1-3:

Hooray for Hootie! At last we have a real man who can resist the histrionics of the pushy feminists. It's so refreshing to know that somewhere there is an American man willing to stand his ground -- on any issue -- and tell the feminists he is not going to knuckle under to their nagging, extortion, pressure tactics or media tantrums.



William Johnson, known to friends as Hootie, is the president of the Augusta National Golf Club located in northeastern Georgia which has hosted the world's most famous golf tournament, the Masters, ever since 1934. An outfit called the National Council of Women's Organizations (NCWO) has been trying since June to force the all-male golf club to alter its admissions policy and admit women.

Hootie responded by saying the club will not submit to pressure to change its admissions policy from an "outside group with its own agenda." Calling NCWO's tactics "offensive and coercive," he added, "We will not be bullied, threatened or intimidated. We do not intend to become a trophy in their display case."

Bully for Hootie. He probably read the Supreme Court's decision in the Boy Scouts case, wherein the High Court upheld the right of private associations to set their own membership rules.

The *New York Times* says that Hootie "counterpunched with harsh words and a complete resistance to bowing to the demands." The reporter must have been shocked, shocked that any man has the nerve to resist and counterpunch against the feminists (even though the feminists have been claiming for years that they want to be treated like men instead of ladies).

In July, the NCWO got malicious, going to Coca-Cola, IBM and Citigroup to demand that they terminate their corporate sponsorship of the Masters tournament unless the Augusta National Golf Club changes its policy. The NCWO got easy help from feminist friends in the media: only Hootie, but not the NCWO, was targeted as "defiant" and "angry" by the *Associated Press*, and as "defiant" and "combative" by the *New York Times*.

Hootie then announced that the Club would cancel commercial advertising on the televised 2003 Masters tournament in order to protect the corporations from the feminists' wrath. The Masters tournament already gets the highest television ratings, and its fans will no doubt cheer at the delightful prospect of watching a sports event without any commercials.

Maybe Hootie suspected that the corporate executives wouldn't have the stamina to stand up to the feminists. He's probably right. Most corporation executives get wobbly in the knees when the feminists start chanting their mantra "discrimination."

The feminists tried to use Tiger Woods, who won the Masters this year for the third time, as a prop in their publicity stunt to advance their special-interest agenda. When asked what he thinks about Augusta National's rules, Tiger replied with the good sense that has made him a star and a role-model: "They're entitled to set up their own rules the way they want them."

A spokesman for the Royal & Ancient Golf Club, which runs the British Open at Muirfield where women are excluded as members, commented, "We take the Open to the best links in the British Isles. We don't engage in social engineering."

The name of the National Council of Women's Organizations is a misnomer because it's not a "women's" council, it's a feminist council

The NCWO has typical feminist goals such as Barbara Boxer's current passion: ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW). NCWO members are probably hoping to be named to CEDAW's Article 17 Committee of "experts" to monitor compliance so they can harass Hootie with UN backing.

See <http://www.eagleforum.org/column/2002/sept02/02-09-11.shtml>

Kohl, *From Archetype to Zeitgeist*, 159:

It is important always to remember that change is measured from the perspective of the prior status quo. Once you discover the nature of that situation, you can begin to understand the direction of the change that is taking place. (p. 159)



- 65- From Kohl's "vocabulary of ideas" we have learned that the cultural revolution has identified anyone in authority as a threat to its objective of an utopian society where all are equal. "Authoritarian" organizations, such as the marriage, family, church, business, or nation—even the Boy Scouts—are structured in such a way that those who submit to them are in danger of being classified as potential fascists.
- 66- Submission to authority causes children to become oriented to rules and regulations that are structured on absolute principles. From this comes the development of an inventory of ideas based on "rights and wrongs" which serves to identify and define "good and bad" behavior. When based on either establishment or biblical principles then the child's personality begins to orient to the Anglo-Saxon culture and the Judeo-Christian ethic of our Western European heritage. Later they orient to other concepts such as "legal and illegal" which are also based on Western culture. Over time they encounter those of other cultures, nations, and societies whose norms and standards are in many ways different. Sometimes this difference is so pronounced that the "American" will reject certain aspects of the "foreigner's" culture.
- 67- When this rejection is based not so much on the fact that the child is simply unfamiliar and unaccustomed with these cultural differences but rather identifies them as being wrong, the child is considered to be "prejudiced."
- 68- However, in our example, the child's evaluation is based on the laws of divine establishment and biblical doctrines. Because of his submission to these absolute norms and standards what he rejects are opinions or behaviors that he identifies as unacceptable, undesirable, objectionable, rude, base, immoral, corrupt, cruel, or depraved. The cultural Marxist would however call him **ethnocentric** and seek to change the way he thinks through progressive reforms, either radical or revolutionary.