

ACCUSATION BY INSINUATION

Several years ago we were encouraged to be tolerant of others with whom we disagreed. We were admonished to not stereotype people by assigning pejorative names to them. Well, whatever was motivating that good advice has disappeared and apparently many have gotten over any influence that might have had on them.

Both sides of the political spectrum have been and are guilty of using such pejoratives and stereotypes to silence and demean any and all who might disagree with their "special" viewpoints and interpretations of not only current events but also of history.

It seems that the majority of the terms created by those on the "right" are now deemed to be politically incorrect (which is a good thing for most of such characterizations). Those on the "left" have deemed (through media influence) that the pejoratives and stereotypes they use to be "politically correct" and these terms are being used to mold our culture into secular humanism.

One of the old terms that used to be taboo to call anyone who was not an absolute radical such as the "skin heads" and "Nazis sympathizers" of several decades ago was "white supremacists." Now the left and the leftist media and those in the liberal academic world have apparently given their blessings to apply this pejorative term to anyone with a deficiency of pigment in their skin who is not fully supportive of their agenda to have the government involved (read that as "in control") in every phase of our lives.

In events that should remind us of the "brain washing" techniques of Mao-Tse Tung, people are being pressured to "confessing" that they are guilty of "white privilege" and apologizing to all those with more pigment for being born white. If "confessions" are not forthcoming, then those in academia could lose their job or there could be riots on campuses. The next step that has unfolded is to equate "white privilege" with "white supremacy."

The plan (which reminds us of Alinsky techniques) is to take a deplorable example and stereotypically apply it to anyone whether they are deplorable or not. (But, wait, many have already been declared to be deplorable if they did not support a certain candidate in the last election cycle.) Now all that remains is to have "everyone of influence" denounce all those who have been labeled as being part of the "deplorable" group whether they are guilty or not. They are obviously guilty by association – their skin is white and they did not vote the right way. Those who voted the right way get a "pass." This is accusation by insinuation!

Another (newer) example of pejoratives and stereotyping is seen the newly minted hyphenated word "alt-right." When we first heard the term, it was being applied to

those supporters of the newly elected president who were considered to be "too radical" and seemed to be more or less categorized as being equivalent to those in the KKK. Now, the "alt-left" are moving to include anyone who is a staunch supporter of the president in the category of "alt-right." By making this "association" those that have been called "Trump haters" (a title that many proudly wear) are trying to delegitimize anyone who would support any of the initiatives that the president might propose. This sounds a lot like an Alinsky technique. This is another example of accusation by insinuation.

The political implications are seen in that anyone who would oppose "open borders" does so because they are racists or "white supremacists." Any who think that "refugees from the war-torn Islamic countries" should be thoroughly checked out are taking such a stand because they are bigoted racists (or the new pejorative term "Islamophobic") rather than simply being concerned about terrorist coming into our nation. Any implication of thinking in terms of "America First" is simply an expression of "white supremacy" ideas. The trend to labeling anyone who opposed the policies and actions of the previous administration started during that administration as an attempt to squelch any challenges to the program to radically transform our nation.

The "apology tours" of the last administration that were designed to lessen the influence our nation has had in the past is now being rolled out so that now everyone needs to "apologize" if they have been successful and then, in our "state of guilt," redistribute our resources in the form of giving large sums of money to our economic competitor nations to help them "clean up the environment" which they are polluting. The example is "pulling out of the Paris Accords on Global Warming was characterized as racism."

"White privilege guilt" had caused people to vote for candidates based on the amount of pigment they have in their skin. The implications of "male privilege" and the attempt to induce guilt was used in the last election cycle to try to gain votes for one of the candidates. More recently, the "backlash" against that kind of manipulation of voters was effectively used to elect a person with no political background to the highest office in the land. Some of the "alt-left" have claimed that the majority of those who voted for the current president did so because of the "racial undertones" of his campaign and these were obviously guilty of being "white supremacists." When all our decisions are based on emotions rather than "reason" and consideration of the long-term consequences, then the outcome produces confusion and eventual chaos.

Coming out of all this chaos will be "increased control of our lives by the government." Of course, that was the original objective of the chaos. Many are seeing the chaos and have been and are still clamoring for increased taxes (on the

rich) and "free medical care" controlled by the government (paid for by the increased taxes). The ability to tax and the control of medical care are two of the most powerful "politically correct" ways of controlling the masses.

Now that these pejorative terms and stereotypical ideas have been introduced and the inclusive associations insinuated, the stage is set to get all organizations of influence to condemn those who fit the expanded definition of the pejorative terms. The condemnation would then be applied to any and all who do not conform to the current "politically correct ideas" of those who are attempting to control public opinion. If a particular organization does not gullibly fall for the trap that is being set, then they are castigated and accused of being FOR all the hyper bad characteristics that are associated with the original meaning of the pejorative term. This same sort of tactic was used to pressure companies to advertise in LGBT publications. If a company refused to pay the extortion by not buying advertising space, then boycotts were threatened and accusations made that the company was "homophobic" or they were guilty of some sort of hate crime.

If a particular organization "condemns" the alt-right, racism, and white supremacy, then there will be an implication that they "support" open borders and redistribution of wealth and other resolutions will follow in an attempt to transform that organization into one that is "politically correct" in other areas. The converse of this consequence would be that anyone who is against open borders and for controlling our national borders, opposes bringing in un-vetted "refugees" from Islamic controlled areas, opposes same gender marriage or opposes abortion on demand is obviously in league with the alt-right, racists, homophobic, anti-feminists, white supremacists. Accusation by Insinuation.