

Mistaking words for thoughts:

Language is supposed to do our speaking for us. Instead, for many if not most people, language does our thinking for us.

I mean by this curious phrase that we tend to reify words- that is, we turn them into concrete objects- and then let the word stand for the thing, without bothering to examine the thing itself.

WE DO THIS in every area of life, because it is simple, it is comfortable, and it escapes the hard necessity of making our minds do our thinking for us.

Take a word like "permissive." Often when I am out of town being interviewed, the interviewer will ask, "Are you permissive with your children?"

There, is really no way to answer a question like this. Usually I reply, "Well, that depends on how you would define permissive," and the interviewer says, "That's just a matter of semantics."

But it isn't; it's far more than "just" a matter of semantics; it's a matter of whether we're going to think with our minds.

Am I a permissive parent? In some things, yes; in other things, no. Do I believe in "discipline"? It depends what you mean by discipline.

These are not evasions or examples of logic-chopping. "Discipline" standing all by itself is a dumb word, some discipline is good; some is bad. Like kinds simply allow him to take advantage.

On another tack, interviewers will ask me if I consider myself to be a "liberal." What does this mean, really? I consider myself a radical in some matters, and a conservative on still others. I don't have a monolithic philosophy to fit all situations.

AND YOU CAN BET that anyone who does have a monolithic philosophy is more of a danger to society than a contributor to it- because different problems call for different solutions, and some solutions have to be radical, while others have to be conservative. If you are ideologically wedded to one dogma or another, you don't have the flexibility to cope with the need for order or the need for change.

Perhaps the greatest problem facing mankind- underlying all the substantive problems- is his reliance on language to do his thinking for him. I am radical: therefore I will defend the indefensible bombing of a University of Wisconsin building. I am a conservative: therefore I will defend the indefensible 'grafting' of a petty crook like Agnew. With such robot-like reactions, no human communication is possible, no social dialogue, and no political progress on any front.

1. Dictionary- reify: vt. = to treat (an abstraction) as substantially existing, or as a concrete material object-
reify: tr. v. = to regard or treat an abstraction or idea as if it had concrete or material existence-

2. Richard T. La Piere: A Theory of Social Control; McGraw Hill Book Co. Inc. New York, 1954

"THE NEED FOR REIFICATION: All the larger symbolic constructs of a society are so distinctly related to the concrete problems of daily life that they must be reified before they can serve even the true believer as guides to actual conduct- i.e., they must be reduced by interpretation, including definition of the terms of the construct, to the concrete, to specific rules of conduct. The process of reification is subject to wide variation in form and may occur on any one of several levels." page 260

3. Alfred R. Lindesmith and Anselm L. Strauss: Social Psychology; The Dreyden Press, New York, 1949

"The mind-body error may be avoided if one remembers that such terms as mind and thought refer to activities rather than to entities.

A question frequently asked, "Does the mind control the body?" is really nonsensical since the term "mind" itself refers to bodily activity." 211

- People often refer to the mind as a concrete thing (reify) when it is actually an abstraction referring to activities/processes of the central nervous system.

4. "We are a government of laws and not of men"---The Chinese say; "if a word does not stand for what you mean, it is a fraud."

- government= an abstraction, but is reified as concrete/yet no government CAN ACT without men.

- laws= are abstractions, but are reified as concrete/yet laws can not be enacted/written/voted without men; laws can't be interpreted without men; laws can't be judged without men; THE HIGH PRIESTS OF WORDS[are members of legal system who specifically WRITE, INTERPRET, and JUDGE the laws; The Constitution is whatever the Supreme Court Justices want it to mean;

Therefore the above expression is a fraud--but we accept "frauds" daily; i.e. legally, a corporation is treated as a person. BUT, HOW CAN YOU TREAT AN ABSTRACTION AS CONCRETE? ONLY BY REIFICATION.

5. We Americans are against and fighting Communism since 1917 (70 years); exception during WW2, the Communists were are allies; technically only 10% of the Russian people/population are eligible for membership to the Communist Party. President Reagan calls the Communists an evil empire; no one protests; but-if we say all Russian people are evil; logically, that would be absurd. Communism=abstraction/Russian people=concrete

6. Segregate, Desegregate, Integrate

- segregate= keep others at a social distance (a form of supremacy), "keep in your place"/ both publically and privately (most of U.S. History)
- desegregate= reduce the social distance of "others"/but only publically via Civil Rights Laws, not privately
- integrate= is no social distance, is assimilation, is social acceptance, which is by INVITATION ONLY i.e. the primary group= a small group such as friendships, family, private clubs, neighborhood gangs etc. Millions of words and dollars have been expended on integration (an abstraction) that can only be found in small groups; hence integration is a fraud; We Americans are shifting from segregation to desegregation of a society (large group- or secondary group); integration can only occur in a small group- or primary group. Chas. Horton Cooley developed the concepts of primary/secondary groups in the early 1900's, I think.

7. Social Distance: By Emory S. Bogardus, 1928; see attached page 388; Collective Behavior.

- in the above author's time, he called nationalities as different races. Anthropologists disagree as to how many different races there are in the world- I chose the general categories of caucasoid, mongoloid, and negroid- approximating what American society responds to others on the basis of skin color/social visibility. NOTE: Germans ranked 9th; Italians 18th; Japanese 33rd; Negroes 35th. From the Japanese 33 down to Hindu 40 the scale indicates very little social acceptance of "others" by the Caucasoid race or mostly social rejection of "others." This scale suggests the latent but deep seated racism that exists in our society, 1928 then, 1987 now. True, Civil Rights laws has reduced public prejudice/discrimination, but, not privately; covert discrimination is beyond the reaches of the law, can't prove, can only infer, but you can infer how you are being accepted/treated. I have yet to see a PC columnist aware of this differential treatment. B. Hosokawa could not understand how G. Ferraro could speak at a political rally displaying both American and Italian Flags simultaneously; whereas a Nisei speaking at a political rally could not display both American and Japanese Flags simultaneously. I am amazed! at his limited perception! journalist! To a famous question: "Why don't they behave like the rest of us Americans?" We Caucasoids don't accept "others"- hence reject "others"/ yet the majority of caucasoids believe with impatience and irritation that it is the minority person's fault, behavior, etc; never once consider that they are the reasons that "others" can't behave like other Americans....

8. Apartheid- re S. Africa: yet we have the "homelands" with the native Americans on quaint reservations; which are quasi-prisoner-of-war-camps administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The B of I have done their best in helping the Indians to become and remain permanent welfare recipients; we Americans should be pointing to S.Africa; hogwash! Still another: the most segregated hour in U.S. is the Sunday hour; a form of apartheid; American Christianity is basically caucasoid and segregated; Christian God believes in segregation. I have never found a logical solution/reason to reconcile this obvious non-acceptance, rejection, in our most ethical of institutions.

9. Return to "Government of laws and not of men" implies just laws; if this were true, there'd be no need for redress. The laws were written and executed by unjust men. My copy letter focused on "citizenship" and "hate"/ both concepts that all Americans can relate to; "race" turns off most Americans. My copy letter will have two additions: sterilization (see

6-26-87 PC M. Masaoka, page 5; genocide (see G.E. Simpson/J.M. Yinger: Racial and Cultural Minorities; Harper & Bros., NY, 1958 ed. p. 35.

- extermination/genocide is an unstated policy of nations during conflict; the following quote is from above source: "Conflict between groups sometimes becomes so severe that physical destruction of one by the other becomes an accepted goal.... The U.S. destroyed perhaps 2/3 rds of the Indian population before her policy changed. The small Tasmanian population was completely wiped out by the British (and by the civilized diseases that they brought to the island).....

ACCOMMODATION AND

388

COLLECTIVE BEHAVIOR

TABLE 13. REACTIONS OF 1725 AMERICANS TO 40 DIFFERENT RACES BY PERCENTAGES*

Regarding races listed below	1 To close kin-ship by marriage	2 To my club as personal chums	3 To my street as neighbors	4 To employ-ment in my occupation	5 To citizen-ship in my country	6 As visitors only to my country	7 Would ex-clude from my country
English.....	93.7	96.7	97.3	95.4	95.9	1.7	0.
Americans (native white) ..	90.1	92.4	92.6	92.4	90.5	1.2	0.
Canadians.....	86.9	93.4	96.1	95.6	96.1	1.7	.3
Scotch.....	78.1	89.1	91.3	92.8	93.3	1.7	0.
Scotch-Irish.....	72.6	81.7	88.	89.4	92.	16.7	.4
Irish.....	70.	83.4	86.1	89.8	91.4	4.	.7
French.....	67.8	85.4	88.1	90.4	92.7	3.8	.8
Welsh.....	60.8	72.3	80.	81.4	86.	5.4	.3
Germans.....	54.1	67.	78.7	82.6	87.2	6.7	3.1
French-Canadians.....	49.7	66.4	76.4	79.3	87.	4.4	.8
Swedes.....	45.3	62.1	75.6	78.	86.3	5.4	1.
Dutch.....	44.2	54.7	73.2	76.7	86.1	2.4	.3
Norwegians.....	41.	56.	65.1	72.	80.3	8.	.3
Danes.....	35.	52.2	65.5	71.4	80.1	4.5	.9
Spaniards.....	27.6	49.8	55.1	58.	81.6	8.4	2.
Finns.....	16.1	27.4	36.1	50.5	61.2	12.8	2.8
Russians.....	15.8	27.7	31.	45.3	56.1	22.1	8.
Italians.....	15.4	25.7	34.7	54.7	71.3	14.5	4.8
Portuguese.....	11.	22.	28.3	47.8	57.7	19.	3.3
Poles.....	11.	11.6	28.3	44.3	58.3	19.7	4.7
Hungarians.....	10.1	17.5	25.8	43.	70.7	20.3	7.
Roumanians.....	8.8	19.3	23.8	38.3	51.6	22.	4.6
Armenians.....	8.5	14.8	27.8	46.2	58.1	17.7	5.0
Czecho-Slovaks.....	8.2	16.4	21.1	36.	47.4	26.	9.5
Indians.....	8.1	27.7	33.4	54.3	83.	7.7	1.6
Jews, German.....	7.8	2.1	25.5	39.8	53.5	25.3	13.8
Bulgarians.....	6.9	14.6	16.4	19.7	43.1	21.9	7.0
Jews, Russian.....	6.1	18.	15.7	30.1	45.3	22.7	13.4
Greeks.....	5.9	17.7	18.	35.2	53.2	25.3	11.3
Syrians.....	4.3	13.8	18.	31.	41.1	21.4	9.
Serbo-Croatians.....	4.3	10.4	12.	10.3	30.4	18.6	8.
Mexicans.....	2.8	11.5	12.3	77.1	46.1	30.8	15.1
Japanese.....	2.3	12.1	13.	27.3	29.3	38.8	2.5
Filipinos.....	1.6	15.2	19.5	36.7	52.1	28.5	5.5
Negroes.....	1.4	9.1	11.8	38.7	57.3	17.6	12.7
Turks.....	1.4	10.	11.7	19.	25.3	41.8	23.4
Chinese.....	1.1	11.8	15.9	27.0	27.3	45.2	22.4
Mulattoes.....	1.1	9.6	10.6	32.	47.4	22.7	16.8
Korean.....	1.1	10.8	11.8	20.1	27.5	34.3	13.8
Hindus.....	1.1	6.8	13.	21.4	23.7	47.1	19.1

* EMORY S. BOGARDUS, IMMIGRATION AND RACE ATTITUDES (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1928), p. 25.

between individuals or groups in terms to share with the other. Such a test i

* By means of a social-distance scale, reactions of native-born Americans to It should be indicated that the great m North European descent. They wer ships they were willing to admit the m the best or the worst members, but m sentative or average"). The results a distance increases as one goes down groups as the Japanese, Negroes, Tur for those that come from northern E usual in-group, out-group lines.