

Leftists, Insults, and Idiots

In a recent email I called a particularly annoying, America-hating, Obama-loving leftist an “idiot.” For months he had been calling me a “tea-bagging Nazi” and arguing that my mother should have aborted me—comments which I ignored because I was more interested in learning from the exchanges how a typical Obot thinks (or fails to think). Not surprisingly, his “thought process” consisted mostly of belching up what he had been fed by the Democrat National Committee, MSNBC in general, and Chris Matthews in particular. At any rate, after having insulted me non-stop for months he decided my calling him an “idiot” was over the top: “How dare you insult me!” That got me to thinking about the nature of insults... as well as the nature of leftists.

An idiot, according to one published definition, is “a mentally deficient person, or someone who acts in a self-defeating or significantly counterproductive way.” Someone who is ignorant, on the other hand, may have reasonably adequate mental abilities but can make foolish statements and poor decisions simply because he does not know any better. A teenager who wears a Che Guevara T-shirt is not necessarily an idiot; he may simply not know enough about Guevara to realize he is celebrating an immoral, murderous, communist thug. But adult Hollywood leftists—who not only wear Guevara T-shirts, they make movies honoring him—generally *have* been presented with the evidence of Guevara’s past and are therefore not ignorant. *Their* worship of Guevara is not the result of ignorance; it is a sign of idiocy.

It is not an insult to call an idiot an idiot; it is merely a statement of fact. As an example, to advocate raising the minimum wage to “help the poor” when, in actuality, it would put many poor people out of work, is most certainly a “self-defeating” or “counterproductive” action. Most leftists support increasing the minimum wage; increasing the minimum wage is counterproductive and self-defeating; therefore, most leftists are idiots. *That is simple logic, not an insult.*

An insult typically is a statement that is *not* factual: “You’re a Nazi!” “Your mother wears combat boots,” “If your nose were any bigger Robert Reich could use you as an umbrella,” “You have fatter thighs than Michelle Obama,” etc.. Leftists tend to resort to junior-high name-calling, such as calling conservatives “tea baggers” when, in fact, the repulsive act to which the term refers is typically performed by leftist gays and not conservatives. (On CNN a few years ago, Anderson Cooper and David Gergen seemed to enjoy using the term to ridicule Tea Party conservatives. I had to look it up to discover what they were talking about. Draw your own conclusions.) Leftists also frequently refer to Tea Party supporters as Nazis, when, in fact, leftist policies are *far* closer to fascism than anything I have ever heard advocated by liberty-promoting conservatives.

It is easy for conservatives to laugh off insults from leftists because they are understood to be inaccurate and based on raw emotion, rather than reasoned logic. (I know I am not a Nazi and that I abhor fascism; my mother never wore combat boots; no one’s nose could

be quite that big; and few people have fatter thighs than you-know-who.) But while leftists hurl (typically crude) invectives, conservatives tend to use labels and descriptions that leftists incorrectly consider insults *simply because they are accurate*.

Conservatives can readily ignore the leftists' typically childish insults, but leftists themselves get *very* upset when *accurate* labels (which they misconstrue as insults) are applied to them. Why? Because those labels reach the core of their being. The easiest way to make someone angry is often to state something negative about him that is *true*. For example, calling a lazy person lazy is upsetting to him not because it is an insult but *because he does not like to be confronted with reality*. That is why so many senior citizens get upset when Social Security is described as a Ponzi scheme that is going broke. That description is *accurate*, but the people who for decades bought into the con game do not want to accept reality. It is far easier for them to respond, "You're a Nazi who should have been aborted!" than to admit, "You are correct, and we really ought to examine the system to find ways to address its fiscal problems."

Similarly, describing the current state of the nation as "producers versus parasites" is most likely to offend those parasites who already understand that they are parasites. The parasites who don't realize they are parasites are not offended; they simply ignore the statement and blissfully go about their parasitic ways. It is the parasite who has been spotted, despite his (sometimes elaborate) camouflage, who is outraged.

As proof of my argument, simply ask a leftist what he thinks after reading the above.

Don Fredrick
April 14, 2013