

## PragerU's Equivocation on "Wealthy"

PragerU made a twitter thread attempting to debunk alleged myths about wealthy people, like that their success is due to luck or inheritance. I've already critiqued some of their arguments individually, but there's a flaw that's common to all of them.

Each argument has the following structure:

(P1) [Premise about millionaires]

(C) [Conclusion about wealthy people]

But there's an equivocation here—an ambiguity in a word is being exploited to make the argument seem more convincing than it is.

The word 'wealthy', like the word 'tall', is context-sensitive—what it applies to depends on the context in which it's used. For instance, what counts as 'tall' depends on whether we're talking about basketball players or preschoolers.

Similarly, what counts as 'wealthy' depends on who we're comparing. In some contexts, being a millionaire is sufficient to count as wealthy, especially when compared with those who own very little.

But millionaires range from those who've earned a million dollars over a lifetime of working and saving to those worth hundreds of millions.

In political contexts, when talking about the harmful influence of concentrated wealth, we intend the word 'wealthy' to refer to those who control much more resources than just a million dollars, like billionaires.

And claims about people with that sort of wealth can't be debunked using studies about mere millionaires.