**Author response:**

I would like to thank the editor and reviewers for their thoughtful and encouraging feedback, as well as the sources they provided, which I believe have greatly contributed to my work. I appreciate their time and effort in reviewing my manuscript and providing valuable insights. Please find my responses below in blue. Amendments made in the revised paper are marked in yellow and are also pasted below.

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:

**Reviewer: 1**Comments to the Author
The paper “The conceptual meaning of the label ‘PC’…”, proposes a five-stage historical model for analysing the process in which words become offensive and the role of the ‘PC’ label in this process. Taking the expression of ‘Autist’ in Israeli public discourse as an example, the paper shows how the word originated in clinical context, turned into an insult and finally into a taboo word. The author suggests that once the label 'PC' appeared in public discourse in relation to ‘Autist’, the labeling “itself and resistance to it play[ed] a central role in spurring public debate that may bring about” a linguistic change. The paper in highly interesting and well written, suggesting a fresh critical and historical look on the social phenomenon of politically (in-)correct.
In what follows I suggest several modifications to consider while revising the paper.

General comments

1. The process of linguistic change described by the condemnation model reminds the dynamic of scandals. I suggest to discuss the similarities and differences between the two, and to elaborate about the roles of scandals, especially media and talk scandals, in facilitating such a linguist change. The following references may be useful:
Ekstrom, M, and Johansson, B. (2008) Talk scandals. Media, Culture and Society. 30(1): 61-79.
Horovitz, M. (1997). Political scandalous statements in Israel: Cause, characteristics and manipulative uses. Hebrew Linguistics, 42-41: 76-77. (Hebrew)
Lakoff, R. T. (2000). The language war. University of California Press.‏
Lull, J, and Hinerman, S (1997). Media Scandal. New York: Colombia University Press.

Amended. Please see p. 12, where I've integrated these sources to highlight the differences between the framework used in my study and media scandals:

*Research on the dynamics of scandals, particularly talk scandals as described by Ekström and Johansson (2008), focused on their immediate and sensational impact on public discourse. These studies address expressions that have caused scandals but do not treat them historically. Transgressive expressions are typically analyzed in the context of the time their speakers used them, without considering their previous uses in different historical periods and changes in meaning that make them offensive. Horovitz (1997) explained that a scandal results from a social event that indicates a break in social and linguistic conventions. Nevertheless, these conventions are not static; they are shaped through discourse over time. Horovitz provides many examples of transgressive expressions from the mid-1990s, making a phenomenal case study for that period (in the Israeli context), but not for understanding how each of these expressions developed over time. Although scandal theory sometimes mentions the importance of socio-historical changes in norms (e.g., Thompson, 1997: 39-40), its investigation of the past is usually limited.*

1. Throughout the conceptual framework the author uses the term “condemnation” to explain the force that initiates the linguistic change. If condemnation is crucial for the model (as the title of the paper suggests), there is a need to define the term and its force (possibly with speech act theory and the writing on political condemnations). I also wonder, why the term condemnation was chosen in the first place and not criticism, for example.
Kampf, Z. and Katriel, T. (2016). Political Condemnations: Public Speech Acts and the Construction of Moral Discourse. Handbook of Communication in Cross-cultural Perspective. Routledge.

Amended. Please see p. 9, where I've used this source to elaborate on my use of the term 'condemnation':

*I chose the term 'condemnation' over 'criticism,' as it more accurately captures the speech act performed by speakers when attacking transgressors. Unlike the broad notion of criticism, condemnations entail elements such as a call to action, the marking of the transgressor as deviant, and the assertion of the condemner's authority (Zohar and Katriel, 2017).*

1. I agree with the author that there is a need for “conceptual history in PC research” and that the advantages of such a perspective is clear. I wonder, however, what is the benefit of using “Conceptual historians” writing over approaches that are better known for discourse scholars like historical pragmatics (especially the works of Culpeper and Jucker on (im-)politeness) or the critical historical discourse approach (see Resisgl and Wodak). I am not asking the author to replace the current conceptual framework with a different one, just to be reflexive about the advantages\disadvantages of the alternatives and maybe to integrate some insight from other frameworks in the proposed model. For example, according to Culpeper (2011), changes in impoliteness are mainly perceptual and result from two main factors: wider publicity and growing sensitivity. I believe that some of the current findings can be explained by these factors.
Culpeper, J. (2011). Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence. Cambridge University Press.

Amended. Please see pp. 11-12, where I've added a paragraph explaining the benefits of conceptual history over other frameworks with regard to this research's goals:

*Conceptual history and critical discourse studies (CDS) share many theoretical ideas about the relations between language, society, and history. As Michał Krzyżanowski (2016) points out: "both approaches share the idea that forms of language (discourses/concepts) reappear […] across different fields, spaces and genres" (p. 313). However, while frameworks such as the discourse-historical approach (DHA) tend to focus on categories of expressions (like 'race,' in Reisigl and Wodak [2001]) and the ways they are manifested discursively as a social practice, conceptual history sees each of the expressions that make up that category (including the category name itself) as the focus of analysis to provide a better understanding of the category. In historical-pragmatics, to give an example from another relevant field, the focus is on language behaviors such as (im)politeness (see Jucker and Kopaczyk, 2017; Culpeper and Kádár, 2010), rather than on the specific expressions that make up the category of (im)politeness. What is lacking in research on PC is not the exploration of the PC category itself, but rather an emphasis on investigating the conceptualization of the expressions constituting this category.*

4. Methodology: Please provide further details about the data collection procedure. In the current version, the author briefly mentions that 416 occurrences of autism were found in materials from popular culture in Israel (newspapers, TV and social media). Missing from the account are details about the span of time the data is covering, and how the author assure that the collected data covers substantive instances of autism and the dataset limitations in general. Take for example the claim on pages 13-14 according to which “Until the 2000s uses of ‘Autist’ as a distinct insult were rare.”  From my own recollection, the term was used to offend much earlier in everyday discourse, but this type of data is not represented in the popular culture materials. The indication the author presents for the offensive meaning of the term may be a result of technological change that occurred since the 2000’, namely the rise of social media platforms that publicized the uses of autism as an insult and afford its condemnations by users. The author should at least consider as an option alternative explanation and maybe also acknowledge the limits of the data in the methodological note (see page 10).

Amended. Please see pp. 15-16. I've added the period covered ("during the years 1964-2022") and further elaborated on the dataset limitations, as follows:

*While popular culture affects public discourse, it is important to note that the analysis and claims of this research are limited to the realm of popular culture. Some changes in language occur first in daily public discourse and only after a while, sometimes years, may appear in popular media, and vice versa. However, broadly speaking, the process outlined here reflects changes in both discourses, although the specific timeline indicates changes in popular media and may differ from those in daily public discourse.*

Specific comments

p. 2: The author starts with an infamous story from Israeli public discourse and then moves awkwardly to define PC. The story is revealing, but I suggest either to explain its lesson (How it demonstrates or reflects on what yet to come?) or move it to a different part of the paper (page 18?).

Amended. Please see p. 2, where, following the story, I've added an interpretive paragraph that associates this incident with my paper's argument:

*This incident exemplifies a key function of the 'PC' label that is rarely examined – serving as a precursor stage to the potential acceptance of non-discriminatory language norms, rather than merely a dismissive tactic of opposition. In this article, I argue that the emergence of the 'PC' label represents a pivotal moment where a linguistic suggestion enters the public sphere – not as an immediate change, but as a pending request that must still be accepted or rejected by broader society. This catalyzing role is often overlooked, partly because the very notion of 'political correctness' is so fraught with complexities itself.*

P.6: The author writes: “When someone is being politically correct, even if no explicit condemnation is performed, there is an underlying condemnation to the performance. Saying ‘women’ instead of ‘girls,’ for example, implies a condemnation toward the expression ‘girls.’ Saying ‘chairperson’ instead of ‘chairman,’ similarly, implies that ‘chairman’ is offensive toward women and therefore involves an implicit condemnation of the latter”
Please explain the implicit process of condemnation, possibly with the Grice’s conventional\non-conventional implicatures.

Amended. Please see p. 8, where I've used Grice to explain the implicit process of condemnation:

*In Grice's (1975) terms, the implicit process of condemnation is non-conventional. When speakers imply condemnation toward a non-PC term, the receivers of the implicature may or may not interpret it as condemnation. In contrast, when speakers explicitly condemn the use of a term, for example by saying "calling grown women 'girls' is misogynistic," they are uttering a conventional PC condemnation.*

P. 10, 27: Something went wrong with the configuration of the model.

I have embedded the figure in the revised paper on p. 15. Hopefully, it is clearer now.

P.11: Do you have any indication that the “case of ‘Autist’ is unique to Israeli culture”?

As I cannot fully assert that using this term is unique to Israeli culture alone, I've added 'seems' to clarify the sentence. Please see p. 16:

*The case of ‘Autist’ seems to be unique to Israeli culture.*

P. 14: The author writes: “During this period, another significant and relevant cultural change occurred – the rise of a narrative of pride in the discourse about autism”
Is it a process of reclaiming? The work of Butler on “linguistic vulnerability” seems very relevant to the discussion here.

Butler, Judith. (1997). Excitable Speech: a Politics of the Performative. New York: Routledge.

Amended. I have added the word 'reclaimed' in that paragraph (now on p. 20) to indicate its relevance to the narrative I'm referring to. However, I have decided not to further the discussion about reclaiming as it seems to me to be too big of a divergence from the subject. Reclaiming is one of many aspects that can be integrated into PC condemnations, and it will require a different kind of research to elaborate on their different mechanisms.

P. 19: the author writes about “counter-condemnation tactit”. I suggest to use the conventional terms to describe and analyze “counter-condemnations”:  accounts (or image repair strategies). In the reported case, MK Amsalem justifies the use of Autism, claiming it is not an insult. In the case of “Election period is a bad and ugly period that brings out enormous slime, but mainly a cynical exploitation from little people who see nothing but votes”, Amsalem uses the strategy of attacking the accuser (see Benoit, 1995).

Scott, M. and Lyman, S. (1968). Accounts. American Sociological Review. 33: 46-62.
Antaki, C. (1994). Explaining and Arguing: The Social Organization of Accounts. London: Sage. Chap. 4
Benoit, W. L. (1995). Accounts, excuses, and apologies: Image repair theory and research. Suny Press.

Amended. Please see p. 25. Where relevant, I've integrated the terms 'image repair' and 'attacking the accuser'. I appreciate the suggestion to use 'accounts' instead of 'counter-condemnations'; however, I prefer not to treat counter-condemnations primarily as accounts, since it is important to maintain the possibility that sometimes they are performed in the context of other attempts (such as an attempt to prevent a linguistic change from a conservative position that is not related to the image of a specific person). The following edits were made accordingly:

*Comparing expressions is a common counter-condemnation tactic, aiming to use recontextualization as mitigation (Roberts and Wahl-Jorgensen, 2022: 842-843). Thus, the comparison between 'Autist' and expressions that have not yet reached the status of taboo serves as an attempt by Amsalem to repair his image (Benoit, 2015) by convincing his audience of his innocence.*

*Amsalem continued his counter-condemnation by attempting to reverse roles. Following a tactic akin to what Van Dijk (1992: 114) terms "reversal" concerning denial of racism, Amsalem "attacked the accuser" (Benoit, 2015: 128) by depicting Lapid (and others who condemned him for his expression) as offensive towards autists: “Election period is a bad and ugly period that brings out enormous slime, but mainly a cynical exploitation from little people who see nothing but votes.”*

P 21: The comparison between ‘autist’ and ‘debil’ is intriguing. I suggest to devote a specific section for this important discussion (at the expense of an example or two).

Amended. Please see p. 27. I agree, of course, that the comparison between the expressions is intriguing. Although I attempted to gather data to support the inclusion of a dedicated section on this discussion, I concluded that excessive expansion would be required to address the topic adequately. I've added two comments in the text to emphasize that the comparison is anecdotal and further investigation is needed. Please see below:

*For this purpose, we can anecdotally compare 'Autist' to 'Debil'.*

And further in the paragraph:

*Although further investigation is necessary to pinpoint and analyze the specific stages 'Debil' went through, the notable difference observed is that 'Debil' stopped being used as a clinical term (while 'Autist' remained a clinical term). This contributed to the symbolic separation between the term and the social group it was previously associated with, thus allowing it to be used once again as an accepted insult.*

**Reviewer: 2**Comments to the Author
I appreciated this article. It addresses an important issue and adds theoretical perspectives to the field of research focused on PC, discriminatory language and negotiations of language use. The introduction of a new model to understand the role of PC and condemnations as part of a language change process is ambitious, and could, with some adjustments, provide a useful discourse analytical frame for future research on debates concerning discursive discrimination.
Overall, the paper is well structured and well-written. I have very few comments to the case study on “autist” in Israeli public discourse. I find it illustrative and in line with the argumentation of the condemnation model.
My main comments are instead focused on the contextualisation of PC (as a concept and as a discursive strategy) and the presentation of the model. I have some suggestions for further development of the framework, and I hope they can be useful when revising the manuscript.

First of all, could you please clarify whether the article is concerned with the conceptual meaning of PC (as the title states) or the discursive function or role of PC in public discourse, debates and negotiations. There is a need for some explanation whether the article explores what PC is, or what PC does, or both. This is discussed when you separate PC discourse from discourse about PC, but in order to strengthen your argument, this needs to be addressed throughout the whole paper.

This vagueness in the focus of the paper affects some parts of the manuscript. Reading the title and the background on PC, one is given the impression that this is an article about the concept PC. However, considering the aim and the development of the model, the focus rather seems to be on the discursive process of negotiating and changing discriminatory language. I would say that the latter is the strength of the article, where the study adds new perspectives and knowledge. My suggestion is therefore that the title is changed to match the broader focus on language negotiation and condemnation processes, and that the background part is expanded to cover research on debates and negotiations of discriminatory language. For instance, there is a lot of research concerning debates about racist language, where PC is used along with accusations and denials of racism (e.g Every and Aogustinos’ research on denials of racism). In addition, research has shown how PC works as a strategy for positioning oneself and others in debates. See for example Chris Brickell (2004) on using PC as a tactic to maintain privileges when minority groups raise their voices and are perceived as a threat. Moreover, as the article also recognises at p. 22, previous research has shown how the use of PC could position speakers on a political scale (Fairclough 2003). This could be discussed in more detail.

Thus, I suggest some clarification of the main focus, and the role and importance of PC labelling to the phenomena of positioning oneself and others in public (and often political) discourse. And, if such uses do not appear in the Israeli context, please be explicit about it and explain to the reader how PC is used in Israel compared to for instance USA or UK. This leads to my next point.

Amended. The title has been revised to "The discursive role of the label ‘PC’: Analyzing changes in discriminatory language with the condemnation model". Additionally, I've incorporated a sentence discussing the use of 'PC' in race talk and the label 'PC' as a tactic to maintain a privileged position. Please see pp. 6-7. The following additions were made:

*This way, in debates about racist language, researchers have pointed out that when majority group members are accused of racism, a common response is to represents themselves as victims of 'PC' (Augoustinos and Every, 2007: 138). Additionally, labeling minority groups' demands for equality as 'PC' has been viewed as a tactic to maintain privilege among the labelers (Brickell, 2004).*

I highlighted the parallel between reversal in PC discourse and denial of racism. Please see p. 25:

*Amsalem continued his counter-condemnation by attempting to reverse roles. Following a tactic akin to what Van Dijk (1992: 114) terms "reversal" concerning denial of racism, Amsalem "attacked the accuser" (Benoit, 2015: 128) by depicting Lapid (and others who condemned him for his expression) as offensive towards autists: “Election period is a bad and ugly period that brings out enormous slime, but mainly a cynical exploitation from little people who see nothing but votes.”*

Concerning the role of PC labeling in Israel, please see p. 6, where I've added more on the subject:

*Yet, as a label, 'PC' in Israel still carries the association of a foreign American form of indirectness. Thus, in the Israeli context, calling someone 'PC' does not only mean someone who is a conformist but also someone who conforms to American culture.*

 *These associations are reinforced by the fact that although there is an accepted Hebrew translation of 'politically correct' ('takin politit'), and there were attempts to refer to the translated term 'PC' in Hebrew letters ('TP'), the common uses in Israeli public discourse are the English terms 'PC' and 'politically correct'. Even in writing, people transcribe these terms in Hebrew letters, which also underscore their non-local association.*

As for its function in other cultures, please see p. 16, where I've added two examples for further research:

*An interesting example for this kind of further research may include the changes the expression 'chairman' has undergone (a comparison between Fairclough's [2003: 25] account to Mills's [2008: 104] condemnation half a decade later is a good starting point). Another relevant case study would be the narratives toward homosexuality in New Zealand that in the 1990s were labeled 'PC', as Brickell (2004) described, to construct "the illusion of a new orthodoxy" (p. 117); and consequently, after the turn of the millennium "gave way to newer discourse of love" (Brickell, 2022: 351).*

Although the article introduces some research on PC, I think it would benefit from a deeper contextualisation of the development of the label in different contexts and countries. See for instance Deborah Cameron’s chapter “Words, words, words” in “The war of the words: The political correctness debate” (Dunant 1994), and John Wilson “The myth of political correctness: the conservative attack on higher education” (1995) for introductions to the early development of the concept in the US. What happened to the concept when it was recontextualised in other countries? How is it used in e.g. New Zealand, Australia, UK, Sweden, and other countries where PC debates are common and researchers has studied its various meanings and functions? This research is important for the understanding of what conceptualisations and functions that are unique to different times and places, and what conceptualisations and functions that seem to be general. I am not yet fully convinced that the model is transferable to other context than the Israeli one, so I would like to see some more contextualisation that points out the general features.

Amended. I've expanded on the early developments of the concept and its formations in the US, UK, New Zealand, and Israel. Please see pp. 4-6. The following additions were made:

*The term 'politically correct' has its roots in the 1960s and 1970s American countercultural movements, particularly associated with the New Left. Deborah Cameron (1994) notes that while the term was used straightforwardly at times, its most common usage was ironic. Being politically correct in a straightforward sense meant opposing things like chauvinism and racism. However, being politically correct ironically was often a way of humorously poking fun at the idea of absolute correctness (Cameron, 1994: 19). Yet, as Stuart Hall (1994: 165) observed, the joke backfired on those who used it.*

 *During the 1980s, 'politically correct' ceased to be an exclusive in-group term and was adopted by conservatives who began to use this phrase and abuse it for political gain (Wilson, 1995: 4). This appropriation of 'politically correct' also led to its transformation into a new phrase – 'political correctness'. By the early 1990s, 'PC' had become a popular abbreviation, alongside others that did not survive the test of time, such as the initials 'PCP,' which, according to journalist Richard Bernstein, designated "politically correct person" (The New York Times, 28 October 1990).*

 *There is not a unanimous agreement in research literature regarding political correctness being exclusively an 'American' phenomenon. "As a strategy – and even more, as a political style," Hall (1994:166) argued, "PC was an active presence in British politics in the early 1980s, even though at the time it was known by a different name." However, the signifier 'political correctness' has travelled, as Chris Brickell (2004) described it, from the US to other cultures, gaining different meanings and associations. In New Zealand, for instance, 'PC' appeared during the 1990s with allusions to communism, fascism, and even Nazism (Brickell, 2004: 107).*

*In Israel, the 'new' phenomenon started gaining attention in the late 1980s. In 1987, journalist Gabi Nitzan reported that a friend told him that "in the United States there is a concept called 'PC'" (Koteret Rashit, 14 October 1987). Nitzan and other writers perceived 'PC' as a foreign 'American' phenomenon marked by indirectness and softness, contrasting with the directness of Israeli 'Dugri' culture (Katriel, 1986).*

*In the second decade of the 21st century, a shift in this perception became evident. A string of media scandals ignited vigorous public discourse following remarks made by speakers perceived as offensive to certain social groups (Arabs, Mizrahim, African asylum seekers). Of course, scandals of this type have existed before, but unlike in previous periods, they were now framed in public discourse using the term 'politically correct.'*

*Gradually, 'politically correct' in Israel has shifted from being a denied phenomenon to a discourse that is, so to speak, recognized by 'everyone.'*

Another issue that has to do with contextualisation of PC is the relation between PC and other similar concepts or strategies. In some parts of the manuscript, you mention that there are other expressions that are used similar to PC in debates about discriminatory language, such as “woke” and “cancel culture”. However, these remarks are often put within brackets, as if they are not important. If the model is to be useful for condemnation processes where other labels than PC are prominent, there must be a more elaborate discussion about PC as one example of such labels. With a more stringent focus on the discursive process, you could argue that today´s debate on cancel culture could be understood in a wider perspective of discursive negotiation of discrimination. In addition, I suggest that the model could explicitly address condemnation processes directed at discriminatory behaviour, practices, opinions, etc that are labelled PC. Could these be included in the model? I would like to see the model framed as relevant to more than just those interested in PC or debates about specific expressions. I believe there is potential for a wider range of applications, not least since these are already mentioned at some places (e.g. at p. 9 right before introducing the model).

Amended. I've added more on the discursive function of the labels 'cancel culture' and 'wokeness'. Please see p. 10 for the following additions:

*The discursive negotiation of discrimination underscores the necessity for new labels to critique linguistic suggestions and other initiatives for social change, as well as tools to deal with such critiques. Although these labels refer to different meanings, they share a common function: characterizing suggestions and initiatives as new and fashionable in a negative light, and thus inauthentic, often portraying them as threats to 'our values.' Previous researchers have noted that what is labeled PC typically involves suggestions that challenge the status quo (Lea, 2009: 30), such as calls for innovative change regarding social inclusivity (for example, including works of women and non-whites in the undergraduate curriculum [O'Keefe, 1992: 125-126]).*

*As time passes and certain labels lose their sense of novelty, new ones inevitably emerge to fill the void. For instance, 'PC' as a dismissal label is being replaced in today's discourse with 'cancel culture' and 'wokeness.' On a discursive level, this type of label functions as an indicator of an examination protocol in place. The emergence of labels like 'PC' suggests an ongoing public debate, while their disappearance signifies its (sometimes temporary) conclusion.*

Concerning the potential expansion of the model for a wider range of applications, I hesitate to go beyond the scope of this research. To proceed with caution, I believe that a more thorough examination of various cases using the model is necessary to confidently assert its general applicability. This is why I suggested on p. 13 that such an expansion could be pursued "with the appropriate adjustments."

I really appreciate the historical approach to analyse public discourse on discriminatory language, and I think it is crucial to understand the discursive functions and meanings of PC. However, analysing discourses from a historical perspective is not a new approach, and the paper needs to consider discourse historical research, such as Ruth Wodak’s Discourse Historical Approach that offers methods to study how discourses are changed over time through discursive strategies. Please describe what new perspectives the condemnation model adds to research on discourse change over time.

Amended. Please see pp. 11-12. I've added a paragraph explaining the benefits of conceptual history over other frameworks regarding the goals of this research:

*Conceptual history and critical discourse studies (CDS) share many theoretical ideas about the relations between language, society, and history. As Michał Krzyżanowski (2016: 313) points out: "both approaches share the idea that forms of language (discourses/concepts) reappear […] across different fields, spaces and genres." However, while frameworks such as the discourse-historical approach (DHA) tend to focus on categories of expressions (like 'race,' in Reisigl and Wodak [2001]) and the ways they are manifested discursively as a social practice, conceptual history sees each of the expressions that make up that category (including the category name itself) as the focus of analysis to provide a better understanding of the category. In historical-pragmatics, to give an example from another relevant field, the focus is on language behaviors such as (im)politeness (see Jucker and Kopaczyk, 2017; Culpeper and Kádár, 2010), rather than on the specific expressions that make up the category of (im)politeness. What is lacking in research on PC is not the exploration of the PC category itself, but rather an emphasis on investigating the conceptualization of the expressions constituting this category.*

Finally, I have some comments on specific parts of the manuscript:

P. 3. On row 6, you describe PC as an act of condemnation directed toward an expression that is offensive to a social group. However, at p. 9 you state that PC can also be used to condemn behaviour, opinions, etc. Could you perhaps clarify this?

Amended. Please see p. 9 for clarification:

*Additionally, I employ the term 'expressions' rather than 'words' (or other linguistically exclusive terms) since non-PC objects can manifest in forms beyond spoken or written language. Actions such as mocking a disabled person by imitating certain body gestures, engaging in 'blackface,' or even wearing a leather jacket (in specific social contexts) can be perceived as offensive toward certain social groups (e.g., disabled individuals, Black people, animal rights activists), thus constituting non-PC expressions. Similarly, certain opinions, clothing choices, and even one's taste in music, when considered within a specific social context, can also be seen as non-PC expressions.*

P. 9 and p. 23: Could you discuss a bit more what happens with the PC label in the last stage? You claim that PC evaporates when an expression becomes taboo, but is it really so? Consider research about the impact of taboo to accusations and denials of racism. I would say PC can still be used to delegitimise those that draw attention to taboo breakers.

Amended. Please see pp. 29-30, where I addressed the difference between taboo and non-PC expressions:

*However, this current stage is not necessarily permanent, hence the caveat "for now." Taboos can be challenged, and expressions that have undergone condemnation and become taboo may resurface in the future among speakers who seek to revive their previous usage. It is essential to differentiate between a taboo and a non-PC expression. The latter is subject to debate, and its use, when condemned, can be defended through counter-condemnations that accuse the condemners of inauthenticity, often by labeling them as 'PC' or 'woke.' In contrast, a taboo is an expression whose prohibition has become an unquestioned norm in a culture. When a taboo is violated, the response is typically not a PC condemnation but rather a rebuke based on social norms ("it isn't done," "we don’t say things like this," "this is not acceptable," etc.). Taboo breakers may respond to such rebukes by using labels like 'PC,' but unlike in previous stages, this tactic will not convey the meaning of inauthenticity since a taboo, by its nature, is recognized as authentic, and thus the chances of this tactic succeeding are relatively very low.*

*Over time, however, a taboo can lose its status if the social forces underpinning its prohibition change. In the case of 'Autist' in Israel, if in the future the social status of autists reaches a consensus of equal membership in society, and complaints of discrimination are no longer heard, the taboo against using 'Autist' as an insult may weaken. Other hypothetical scenarios may include existential threats to society itself, such as times of war. These situations can impact values like solidarity with minority groups, making taboos related to them easier to violate without repercussions.*

P. 9. If condemners introduce alternative terms instead of the one perceived as discriminatory, where in the process would this occur?

Amended. I've added a clarification in stage 3. Please see p. 14:

*Some condemners may attempt to reclaim the expression, while others may suggest alternative terms.*

P. 15: Could you explain how the contrastive “but” in this example evokes a negative discourse on autism: “Beilin is gifted, but he is autistic”

Amended. Please see p. 21:

*The contrastive "but" in this statement implies that autism is a negative trait that detracts from Beilin's giftedness, suggesting he lacks the social communication capabilities that a high-level politician needs.*

P. 19: Here it is stated that comparing expressions is a common counter condemnation tactic (r. 54). Is there any reference to previous research for this statement? Consider research on how accusations of racism are countered, e.g. Every & Aogustinos (several articles) and van Dijk (1992).

Amended. I've added a reference to an article by Roberts and Wahl-Jorgensen (2022), which presents and analyzes a similar tactic (a comparison between the January 2020 Capitol Hill riot and Black Lives Matter protests). Please see p. 25:

*Comparing expressions is a common counter-condemnation tactic, aiming to use recontextualization as mitigation (Roberts and Wahl-Jorgensen, 2022: 842-843).*

P. 22: Same here. Are these tactics or strategies shown in previous research?

Amended. Please see p. 28, where I've added a clarification:

*While it is hard to find examples for this exact tactic in previous research, it aligns with other rejection strategies suggested by scholars to avoid the traps of the PC label. For example, Mills (2003) insists on referring to the term only with inverted commas (‘political correctness’), and Feldstein (1997: 183) urges those labeled to "not accept the ‘politically correct’ label that neoconservatives have fabricated to stigmatize them."*