

The Infinite Distance Between Bias and Prejudice (a case study for today)

"And since they did not see fit to acknowledge God, God gave them up to a base mind..." (Romans 1:28)

In popular culture today the words "bias" and "prejudice" are often used as synonyms. Both, for example, refer to our propensity to make decisions that can be more-or-less predicted. For this reason, one commonality between the two is their connection to the state of our "convictions." Yet that is where the similarity ends. *Bias* pertains to our inclination to make decisions on the basis of either *our* experiences, knowledge that we have attained, or moral convictions that we not only hold, but also resolve to consistently put into practice. On the one hand, biases may be grounded on *inadequate* knowledge or *false* perceptions. Yet at the very least they rest on **more than untethered emotions**. In summary, biases are not necessarily negative or immoral, while in certain circumstances they are, to the contrary, highly laudable. The same, however, cannot be said about the second term, "prejudice."

The meaning of the word "prejudice" is nakedly clear by its very grammatical constitution. It consists of the preposition, "*pre*," and the root verb, "*judge*," so that it literally means "*to pre-judge*" or "*to judge before taking into consideration all of the relevant facts*." I am writing this essay in between the official election day (Nov. 3) and the final tabulation and, potentially, assessment of the legitimacy of the ballots cast (who knows when?). One profound oddity about this particular election was the early demand by the Democrats; not only that an absentee ballot be made available to whoever applies for it (all well and good), but further that *mail-in* ballots be made available in the *broad* sense by delivering them to **every** person irrespective of whether it was requested by the addressee. The enactment of this charge further made it possible that masses of people could cast their vote weeks prior to the official election date. Many concerns were raised over the logistical dangers that this arrangement posed.

Yet the concern I wish to highlight is the "moral"¹ aspect of their *motivator* for repeatedly urging people to cast their ballots **early**. The practical (though damaging) result of pressing voters to get their ballot in "*now*," was that votes be completed before the first Presidential debate, and, obviously prior to the 2nd one too. In other words, Democrats **strongly urged prejudicial voting in choosing the next President of the United States**. By so doing, Democrat citizenry cast their ballots in **virtually willful² ignorance** of both the facts and contextual arguments which are crucial for every single voter to know.

This transgression indeed puts the Democrat platform **into contradiction with science** and the principles that undergird its methodology. In other words they are in violation of not only conservative standards, but their **very own criteria**. Although the "scientific method" (**SM**) varies in the details of its criteria according to the field under consideration (biology, physics, or geology etc.), one mandate that is absolutely universal is that in order for a valid conclusion to be reached, **all of the relevant data** must both be drawn together and rigorously analyzed. Had the (self-lauded "scientific") Democrats honored SM, they would have heeded the *bias* of caution that it demands so as to scrutinize the merits of the respective cases, and in the current highly-pressing crisis, rationally ponder the direction that its Party's incompetent candidate will lead our nation. Because they show no signs whatsoever of doing so, it is not a scientific *bias* that leads them, but **prejudicial blindness that stupefies them**.

Gary Jensen, Pastor © November 7, 2020
Holy Trinity Lutheran Church (NALC), Berlin, PA, USA gjensen549@gmail.com

¹ I employ the word, "moral" here solely as a category of potential motivators. I am not affirming that Democratic principles are based on classical moral values.

² Although readers may object to my application of the word "*willful*," by the fact of denunciations of televising the riots by alphabet stations, Democrats have no excuse for being in ignorance of their existence.