

Liberals are, well ... strange!

By MacPundit

Let's be honest, Liberals are not always rational



"Remember, democracy never lasts long. It soon wastes, exhausts, and murders itself. There never was a democracy yet that did not commit suicide. *John Adams*"

If you ask a Conservative what Romney's plan is for the next four years, he or she might tell you about the Five Point Plan Romney laid out in his acceptance speech and suggest that you can read the details on Romney's website. However, liberals may give you a completely different response when you ask them a similar question.

For example, ask a Liberal what Obama's plan is for the next four years. He or she will most likely change the subject to Romney and tell you that Romney has no plan. If you tell him that Romney does have a plan, he will continue talking as though he didn't hear you—which could be true—and say something like "Obama's not going to take away a woman's right to vote, like Romney will." When you point out that what he just said is not true, he will—you guessed it—continue talking

as though he never heard you. Like a programmed talking doll, he may tell you things like Obama is for middle-class working people, which is a populist talking point designed to imply that Romney is against middle-class working people. But, once again, if you tell him that is just one more big liberal lie, he will either keep on talking, or maybe give you a blank stare—you know, the kind you see when someone's brain has just gone into standby mode.

In any case, he will not tell you what Obama's plan is for the next four years, because he can't. Not only does he not know, but he will probably be very annoyed with you for having asked the question in the first place. He may even act as though you just scuppered him with an unfair, trick question. Now remember, the question was, "What is Obama's plan?" If you could read his thoughts, you might get this: "I hate it when they ask questions like that! I just know that whatever Obama's plan is, it's better than Romney's—whatever his is."

Am I generalizing? Yes, but not by much. I have to look far and wide to find a liberal with real knowledge of the players and issues in this campaign. (I just paused to think about that last sentence and at the moment, I cannot think of a single conversation I've had recently with a liberal who knew the real facts about either candidate or the most important issues.)

Case in point

Just last week, I was talking to a liberal who began to opine on the class warfare "fairness" thing. He said rich people should pay their fair share. Naturally, I agreed and pointed out that they are, that the wealthiest top 10% already pay 71% of the entire federal income tax bill. I also mentioned that 47% of American wage earners don't pay any federal income tax at all. Not surprisingly, for a few seconds I saw that familiar, though strange, my-brain-is-on-standby, look in his eyes. Then his girlfriend handed him a laptop and suggested he

look it up.

Now before I continue, you need to know that this guy is an intelligent, articulate man who presents himself as being well versed in current political issues. Yet the stats I had just given him were, apparently, as foreign to him as $E=mc^2$ would be to an orangutan.

Anyway, he cranked up the laptop and when he appeared to be intently reading something on the screen, I asked what he found. He said, "It says 47% of wage earners do not pay any federal income tax." It was a revelation but, sadly, not an epiphany because shortly thereafter he told me that George W. Bush lied about Saddam Hussein having WMD. Imagine that! After all these years he was still repeating that raggedy old liberal myth. (See Is Obama More Dishonest Than Nixon, Reagan, And G.W. Bush?)

Millions have been stricken

This very strange behavior among liberals is widespread. Many books have been written on the topic and while it is tempting to dismiss liberals as plain, old-fashioned ignoramuses, the truth is more complex. For example, many—perhaps even most—liberals think of themselves as being more intelligent and knowledgeable than the general population. Yet their behavior belies that assessment. They express a firm belief in Darwinian evolution, yet their resistance to certain types of knowledge implies an inability to grow intellectually. (See Liberal Ignorance – Economics) Also, this oft displayed sense of superiority makes one suspect an overcompensation for a sense of inferiority.

Then there is the mob-think, adoration thing, which was on display once again at the 2012 Democratic National Convention. As the cameras panned the audience, I could not miss the worshipful looks on thousands of adoring faces as their leader, Barack Obama, spoke. It was truly disturbing. Mr.

Obama is my thirteenth president and until he arrived, I had never seen this kind of unsettling phenomenon before. If you understand the soul of America, you know that this kind of idolization is not a part of it.

What's with the initials?

It is an odd thing, really, that Democrats want us to believe they are the party of the people. It is they, not Conservatives, who transform their iconic figures into something akin to movie star status—or more. The Kennedy presidency became “Camelot” even though Jack Kennedy could, arguably, have been called the philanderer-in-chief. I liked the guy, but with the exception of his economic policies, he was not one of our best presidents. And Camelot? Anything but. And what is this thing they have with initials? FDR, JFK, LBJ? I remember some disappointment among Democrats when Kerry was running because JFK was already taken. They even gave Martin Luther King the MLK label even though he was a Republican and Kennedy had him wiretapped. (I bet some of you liberals just learned something in that last sentence you would rather not know.)

Dispelling some more Liberal myths

Democrats want you to believe that Conservatives and the Republican Party are a bunch of rich guys who only care about themselves. Once again, however, they are either ignorant of the facts or they are being intentionally dishonest. A few years ago, Professor Arthur C. Brooks of Syracuse University did a study on this very subject. He also wrote a book based on the study. Here is a brief summary of his findings:

After exhaustive nonpartisan research into the charitable behavior of liberals and conservatives he found that the average conservative-headed household gives 30% more to charity than the average liberal-headed household. He also learned that among the same households conservatives earn 6% less annually than do liberals. Simply put: Conservatives

earn less but give much more money to charity than do liberals. His study also revealed that of the 25 states where charitable giving was above average, George W. Bush won 24 of them in the 2004 presidential election. Yes, 24 of the 25 most charitable states were red states.

Let's wrap it up.

Most liberals I know will not allow you to engage them in a constructive, informed discussion. Why? Because they can't. They hate any facts that disturb their mindset. Hence, they are unable to mount a rational argument to support their opinions. They know this. They know if they debate you, you will produce real facts, which they will not be able to refute. They will avoid that any way they can.

On the out chance that a liberal is reading this, I must say that statements like the ones made by Kelly Washington and other Democrats at the Democratic National Convention—statements like, Republicans want to take away a woman's right to vote. — were simply made up by nasty, small-minded political hacks who obviously don't give a damn about our country. There is absolutely no basis in truth to support that statement or all the other similar ones made during the DNC. Yet speaker after speaker spit out grossly dishonest remarks over and over again. It was the most disgusting display of dishonesty, ignorance, and dirty politics I have ever witnessed in a major party convention. It also says a lot about the leader of the Democratic Party, Barack Obama. The other speakers simply followed the leader who is, himself, such a prolific liar that fact checkers, literally, have a hard time keeping up with him. (See Documented Obama Lies)

I have said it before: I am uncomfortable every time I connect the "liar" word with my president. But I sincerely believe that because of his ideology and his severe record of deceit and incompetence, our nation is in great danger. I also


believe that we may never recover from the consequences of another four year Obama presidency. So I will continue to call it like I see it as my small part in the effort to defeat Barack Obama in November.

We can easily forgive a child who is afraid of the dark; the real tragedy of life is when men are afraid of the light.

Plato

Liberal Ignorance – Economics

By MacPundit



Economics? Whats that?

For years, I have been fascinated by the high level of economic, political, and historical ignorance I have observed among American Liberals. It is a puzzling and mysterious phenomenon. I continue to encounter it in print, broadcast media, and in personal conversations and debates. While Liberals often self-describe as being more intelligent than people of other political persuasions, their lack of knowledge, which seriously undermines and distorts their arguments, belies this notion. To the contrary, based on the following universally accepted definition of intelligence, one can only conclude that they are, in fact, less intelligent.

intelligence [in-tel-i-juhns] noun

1. capacity for learning, reasoning, understanding, and similar forms of mental activity; aptitude in grasping truths, relationships, facts, meanings, etc.

2008 Zogby International Survey

Below, is a summary of results of a December 2008 Zogby International nationwide survey, which gauged economic enlightenment of 4,835 American adults. The survey was designed by Daniel Klein, an economics professor at George Mason University, and Zeljka Buturorvic, a research associate at Zogby International. Ideologically centered questions were screened out, which left eight basic, core economic questions. In other words, none of the eight questions challenged typical conservative or libertarian policy positions.

Liberals and Progressives had the worst scores

Adults self-identifying as “very conservative” and “libertarian” performed the best, followed closely by “conservative.” Trailing far behind were “moderate,” then with another step down to “liberal,” and a final step down to “progressive,” who, on average, got 5.26 questions out of eight wrong. Progressive/very liberal respondents got four times more wrong answers than libertarians.

The results of the survey did not surprise me. They aligned with my personal observations spanning at least 30 years.

Nor were these results surprising:

Who the participants voted for in the 2008 Presidential Election and the number of economic questions they got **wrong** out of 8.

- McCain 1.60
- Obama 4.61
- Nader 4.92

Political party affiliations of the participants and the number of economic questions they got **wrong** out of 8

- Libertarian 1.26
- Republican 1.61

- Constitution 1.94
- Independent 3.03
- Democratic 4.59
- Green 5.88

Economist, Ron Ross:

“The survey results demonstrate the strong connection between economic ignorance and interventionist enthusiasm. Those who are most determined to interfere with the economy know the least about it.”

“Liberals don’t seem to care that things are the way they are for some very powerful reason or reasons, which explains why unintended consequences are so common and why results are so often the opposite of intentions.”

“What’s always amazed me is that liberals don’t seem to be even the least bit curious about how the economy works. They love taking and using the wealth created by a market economy, but don’t care a whit about the necessary ingredients for creating that wealth – incentives, the price system, or the critical role of private property rights, for example.”

What’s going on?

It has been said for many years that the political left often fail to incorporate basic economic insight into their morals, and politics. Hayek’s compelling and wholly rational theory, which seems to be supported by substantial empirical evidence, provides an explanation.

“The social-democratic ethos is an atavistic reassertion of the ethos and mentality of the primordial paleolithic band, a mentality resistant to ideas of spontaneous order and disjointed knowledge.”

In other words, their thought processes are a throwback to a

primitive time in human development. They resist the inclusion of certain disjointed knowledge (apparently unrelated facts) and, therefore, cannot connect it with other knowledge in order to construct an orderly and reasonable hypothesis. Simply put: They don't connect the dots very well because they are not aware of or simply do not acknowledge some of the dots.

And there's this:

To answer the question, "If they are more intelligent, why are liberals – especially those in Hollywood and academia – so much more likely than conservatives to say and do stupid things and hold incredulous beliefs and ideas that stretch credibility?" – Bruce G. Charlton, Professor of Theoretical Medicine at the University of Buckingham, offers an explanation. He suggests that liberals and other intelligent people may be 'clever sillies,' who incorrectly apply abstract logical reasoning to social and interpersonal domains. (Notice he said, "... liberals and other intelligent people." Is it more than likely that Charlton is, himself, a liberal? I'd bet on it. In simple terms, he goes on to say that while humans have, over millennia, developed what we call "common sense," liberals and other intelligent people lack common sense, because their general intelligence overrides it.

So their intelligence is a handicap? Oh my! Shouldn't there be a special government program for them? Or, wait, should they be allowed to vote, or for that matter, hold responsible positions in our government? After all, they have no common sense and look at all the damage they have done already! I mean they are too smart to function well. That can't be a good thing.

Oh well, at least one thing is clear; they don't question the proposition that liberals are ignorant. They only attempt to explain why.

I suffer not an ounce of doubt that our current president will

go down in history as one of our worst. It is painfully clear to knowledgeable Americans that Barack Obama either has no understanding of how our economy works or he does and is intent on transforming it into something quite different. Of course there is a third possibility: He does not know how it works but still wants to change it. Imagine that. The U.S.A. has been the most successful economy in human history, yet he would endeavor to destroy it. Yes, destroy it, for any meaningful alteration would, necessarily, destroy it.

That may appeal to the ignorant and naïve because they assume that what we have would be replaced with a better economic model, which takes us back to the theme of this post – liberal ignorance.

I'll leave you with this:

Those who are most determined to interfere with the economy know the least about it.