

That “Name Calling”

November 14, 2020

A brief discussion with a Hungarian friend of mine (let's call him “George”) initiated this article. George is a hugely intelligent, deep thinker and a very kind person. He is strait from academic world with all their thinking, analyzing and phraseology. George has a serious problem with tagging various adjectives on people and we have a long standing dispute about the definition of “when does the adjective function as an accurate description”

I will try to argue my side.

Let's start from a well known yardstick of “Al Capone was a gangster.” We could have formulated the “Al Capone was a “somewhat disturbed individual with occasional violent tendencies”, but no, we just say he was a gangster; as he was.

As a continuation of using “name calling” as a deeply negative (and for some people: offensive) connotation, here is another example. What if I call my colleague a day after he and his wife had dinner in my house with my family, asking this: “John, when you guys came yesterday my wife's gold necklace was on the reading table. We don't seem to find it. Are you sure, you didn't take it by accident?” This question is nice, doesn't have a comma worth of “name calling” or negative word however; however, it obviously offends people a thousand times more than if I just told John in a conversation “John, I think your are insane by saying what you've just said.”

So, what's the definition of “name calling?” Where is the fault line between the two? Why people using it? Which “name calling” is just that, and which is an “accurate description” of the person, or what the person said or done? Let me run the argument through an article, appeared on November 12, 2020 in the N.Y. Post, titled **The left's lunatic attack on AG Bill Barr over vote-fraud probes**. Part of the piece reads as follows:

“...Barr “decided to be Donald Trump's personal lawyer,” Rep. Adam Schiff sniffs. The AG is “seeding doubts about the legitimacy of the election,” whines Rep. Jerry Nadler. This would be “a good time to impeach” Barr, huffs The Nation's John Nichols...”

The cited quote provides all explanation, reasoning, example and (in general) all the ammunition someone like me needs. As everyone knows well, throughout the phony “Russia!!!” probe Schiff lied for three solid years into cameras, at press briefings, in the House chamber; it can be confidently argued that if Schiff has ever uttered an honest sentence since he has been in Washington as a House of Representatives elected by the fine place of San Francisco's voters, that was short and by accident only. He is a congenial liar to a point he most probably is a psychopath. Schiff has also committed criminal acts by hiding exculpatory evidences born at the House hearings he ran. That was strait, down the line illegal; he should have been investigated, tried and convicted for it. This is Schiff's background.

The question how come Schiff is still giving interviews, his name is appearing in publications instead of being expelled from the House and being in jail is directly tied to the topic of this piece. The reason can be formulated in three words: **Because He Can.**

It used to be that people with different, well founded opinions argued. There could be a far right and a far left person arguing, without using a single unkind word. When arguments and opinions are well founded and mostly data and fact based, --traditional name calling never takes place.

Unfortunately we have been witnessing a significant shift in this matter, more times than not people ending up in the “Schiff bracket”; the far end of the spectrum. We have been witnessing people making statements, giving assessments, opinions; conducting conversations not having a scintilla worth of underlying thought and/or evidence or data. When it is pointed out to them, the almost uniform defense is “you are name calling”, or “I don't like how you responded.” “How” has become a trump card, an ace; if I don't have anything left to argue with you, or I recognize I was talking stupidity (or lied like Schiff), --then I will object the “how.”. Well, a reasonable answer to this is “stop talking stupidity and stop lying, and I won't point it out.”

The interesting thing is how people above a certain education level using this. How much people using the “you must be nice to me no matter what” like a shield or a shell. To lie, to cheat, to do criminal acts, to talk dumb stupidities --because they know: there will be no one to call them out. No one will use a certain language to penetrate the shield. Because that is “uncool”, because that is “name calling”, because that isn't elegant or “becoming.” If someone in the House of Representatives at any time would have bothered to get on the floor,

That "Name Calling"

November 14, 2020

use video (Schiff's own statements) and photographic evidences, then call Schiff a "lying, no good son of a bitch, an arrogant criminal prick", --that would have gotten through the shield and would have reduced Schiff's lies by 90%. I mean no one wants to be called like that on national broadcast. But it hasn't been happening, and Schiff keeps lying. So long as people's response around Schiff starts with: "My democratic friend Mr. Schiff...", that will not deter Schiff from lying.

It would be a good time to bring Donald Trump's national media tag as "Liars, and "Enemy of the People", -- writing, reporting "Fake News." Trump could have not possibly hit the nail on the head better and with more precision. The "main stream media" which is about 85% of the US total has been manufacturing "reports and facts" for decades, but they hit the deep end around the first year of Obama's presidency. They have never recovered from that sewage. They (as of approx. 405 years ago) truly became "the enemy of the people" by constantly lying, fabricating "news", turning themselves into a "left wing activist" from a "news outlet." By the time Mitt Romney was running for presidency, they amassed so much power, they could turn a Mother Theresa into Adolph Hitler or vice versa. They did it too. The fact the Romney didn't become president had two reasons; the media lied and Romney didn't have a spine and guts like Trump to call them on it. Accidentally, this very example shows the power of what I've been arguing. You either break the shell, penetrate the shield, --or they will use it to destroy you. They destroyed Romney. This "no retribution" national lying feast has gone so far that Harry Reid (who was probably "the most rotten gangster ever stepped into the US Congress building; this definition includes visitors)" as Senate Majority leader (goes to show you how far deep we have sunk)" constantly lied (on the Senate floor, in interviews, -everywhere) about "Mitt Romney didn't pay tax" during the presidential run in 2012. When three years later they asked Reid how factual his assertion was his reply was: "It wasn't but he didn't get elected did he?" The obvious and most appropriate reply to this should have been: "Mr. Reid you are a lying trash, a no good rotten gangster." This reply wasn't made and **Reid did know it will never come. This was the precise and the only reason why he freely lied.**

Then came Trump.... If Trump has done nothing else but cut the American media down to size and invented the "fake news" terminology, --he was one of the best presidents the US has ever seen.

Another interesting aspect of the "who is doing the name calling" is the fact how always, without exception the person who is accused of "name calling" is being put into negative light. I have never participated in a conversation where someone said "Let's wait for a second; did you hear what a stupid idiocy Joe just said?" In other words it has been not only a license given to lie, but the lies, falsehoods, arrogance have been protected by fundamentally decent people, who make the same mistake my friend George did: they think everybody is like them. Unfortunately, in the real world the Adam Schiffs, the Harry Reids and a long-long list of others exist. And these lying gangsters will constantly use the "you shouldn't do name calling" shield so long as we provide them with the shield"

In closing, let me cite two examples where the "name calling" is the "accurate description of the person(s) specific mental or human-spine condition."

It happened in Minneapolis over the last six months. Its City Council has been assembled only by ultra left progressive socialist (I'd say "nut jobs", but that part comes in a minute). The City Council (being so excited in supporting Black Lives Matter, and wanting to be in line with the ongoing trend of "We Hate The Police), voted approx.. four months ago to **defund their police (...)** As "defunded" organizations do, the police force ceased to exist in Minneapolis. Just about immediately after that, on cue, robbery, homicide, extortion, rape, kidnapping, drug sales and other friendly activities spiked; I mean through the roof. And the "spike" stayed there; on high. It resulted in a number of murders across the city. I will entertain suggestions how do you tag grown adults, responsible for running a huge metropolis who are doing this? My opening bid: morons, lunatics, idiots, retards, cretins (I have a dozen others, but those would use more colorful language).

Everyone in America knows that Cuomo, Governor of N.Y. State ordered nursing homes across the state to accept Covid patients back in April this year and by doing so killed approx. 28,000 elderly. When he saw the result of his fine work, he blamed the federal government saying (listen to this, because you cannot make things like this up) **"No one in the federal government told me that this is dangerous"**. As a result of the truly extraordinary activity of the federal government (and the leadership of President Trump), the medical industry has come up with a vaccine roughly five times faster than the normal timeline, producing the first 20 million doses by mid December. The same Cuomo, who just killed 28,000 elderly declared in early November: N.Y.

That "Name Calling"

November 14, 2020

State will "investigate" the vaccine because he doesn't trust what the medical industry has done under Trump's financial leadership. As a result, the President declared: Elderly people will be the first to receive the vaccine across the nation everywhere, except in N.Y. State (for "sensitive souls": Not because the President wants to disadvantage Cuomo; but because the federal government cannot distribute the vaccine without the State's governor's approval). So now, Cuomo will kill a few hundred other people. Back to my question from earlier: how would you characterize Cuomo? Other than "moron, lunatic, idiot, retard, cretin (and you could add: "murderer")?

These -I hope- accurately demonstrate for the "nice souls", the "high-brow academics", and other nice, decent otherwise a bit misguided people: be careful when you call someone a Name Caller and lecture him/her from the high horse you are sitting on. It also should be noted: so long as "nice souls" will run the show, no one will bother to "break the shell", the lunatics and gangsters will thrive, others (people with sufficient IQ) will be dismayed and (as the Minneapolis and Cuomo's cases demonstrate) we also will face a large number of dead bodies.

Have the threshold of name calling become lower and lower throughout the years? Yes. Should it be a lot higher? Absolutely. Is this a good trend? No. Unfortunately, life again doesn't want to comply with dreams. Over the last approx. three decades purposeful lying and making stupid statements have exponentially grown; I -as a conservative- would argue that the occurrence of the Adam Schiffs (Cuomos, City Council members....) of the world has been closely following the exponential growth of social-progressive madness. In other words, the more shield we provide them, the more they will lie, state falsehoods or make statements with no factual basis whatsoever. It is safe to say, that the world for three decades has tried to cuddle everybody and "be civil" to everyone; it clearly has not worked; the number of Adam Schiffs has exponentially grown. We for four years tried the "Donald Trump way"; although everyone was up in arms against his style (of course, after three decades worth of free lying), --but he was effective.

I am sure the real truth is between the end points of the spectrum; we just need to find it.