



The Demonization of the Tea Party

Now that the Tea Party has not only demonstrated its power to force the Republican Party to begin acting like a true party for less government, it has also shown that it has staying power. The elections of 2010 were just the beginning of the Tea Party's ascent to power in Washington, and the liberals are running scared. And when they run scared they begin calling names.

In a two-hour, closed-door Democrat Caucus meeting, Rep. Mike Doyle of Pennsylvania angrily said, "We have negotiated with terrorists. This small group of terrorists have made it impossible to spend any money." Vice-President Biden agreed: "They have acted like terrorists." Biden later denied that he had said that, but after Politico published the remarks, spokeswoman Kendra Barkoff said: "The word was used by several members of Congress."



And many prominent elite liberals are now using similar terms to describe the Tea Party enemy. In one of his columns in the *New York Times*, Thomas Friedman described the Tea Party as the GOP's "Hezbollah faction." And Maureen Dowd wrote that some Democrats were describing the Tea Party as "the Republican 'Taliban wing.' "

Apparently, liberals are unable to recognize traditional conservative Republican positions for less government, lower taxes, a balanced budget, and adherence to the principles of the Constitution of the United States. They have become "terrorists." In other words, constitutionalists are in liberal eyes equivalent to Islamic terrorists who want to blow up buildings and kill infidels. They think that by pinning that kind of ridiculous label on ordinary American patriots, the vast majority of Americans will begin to hate and fear the Tea Party.

What all of this confirms is the deep-seated hatred the liberal left has for our constitutional Republic. They want a socialist government of unlimited power and the end of the American Republic. What this also confirms is that the battle between the leftist socialists and the Tea Party conservatives is bound to become increasingly nasty and rhetorically violent.

It is for all intents and purposes a political civil war that is going to rage for the foreseeable future and divide this country as much as the Civil War divided North and South. We don't foresee the use of physical force, but we foresee the use of every possible non-violent means to achieve liberal political goals in Congress, in the Courts, and in the White House.

Nor are Republicans-for-Compromise any better than leftist liberals. The RINOs are no more pleased with the rise of the Tea Party movement than the Democrats, for the Hegelian Republicans rely on



Written by [Sam Blumenfeld](#) on August 8, 2011

dialectic compromise to advance the nation toward their dream of an undefined, utopian New World Order. The rise of the Tea Party has put a temporary stop to this dialectical process, which is totally foreign to our concept of government. That is why it is as important for the Tea Party to defeat the Republican dialecticians as well as the Democratic left.

And that is why the Tea Party is being called the GOP's "Hezbollah." Liberals in general have no idea what the Tea Party stands for since they believe what liberal bloggers tell them about it. Jeff Jacoby, a conservative columnist at the very liberal *Boston Globe*, criticized Democrats for smearing the Tea Party. It drew this response from a reader:

I agree with Jeff Jacoby's Aug. 3 column "Smearing the Tea Party," in which he criticized some Democrats for using the term "terrorists" to describe the Tea Party. This is clearly over the top, and anyone who uses this term should be ashamed. I prefer "blackmailers," because it more accurately captures the essence of this maneuver. Something that has been purely routine for years was held hostage purely for the sake of changing policy that is normally handled through other, regular means.

In other words, to this liberal, raising this trillion-dollar debt ceiling, which may bankrupt the country, should have been a normal, routine affair. Another reader blamed the decline in the stock market on the Tea Party's "intransigent posture."

"Hostage takers" seems to be the favorite description of the Tea Party by respectable liberals. Which simply indicates that liberals and conservatives simply do not think alike. Conservatives in general are more logical in their thinking, more sure of the principles they believe in, more individualistic in their thinking. Liberals, on the other hand, cannot define the principles on which their beliefs are based. They believe in government as a kind of benevolent sugar-daddy who has the best interests of the people at heart. They rarely complain about government intrusion and regulation, and they have unconsciously accepted such Marxist doctrines as class warfare, expecting the rich to pay their "fair share" of taxes, even though the rich already pay more than their share in taxes.

I believe that the liberal mindset is really based on a personal dissatisfaction with self. That is why so many of them are in psychiatric therapy. I suspect that liberals are the principle users of the many sedatives, stimulants, and mood-altering drugs that the pharmaceutical companies are making millions on.

Conservatives, on the other hand, seem to have a purpose in life. They seem to be stimulated by creative activity and not drugs, and their belief in God gives them a sure guidance for moral behavior. As human beings we are all subject to temptation, but adherence to the God of the Bible provides physical and emotional security which the liberal atheist or agnostic lacks.

Some years ago *Humanist* magazine did a survey on happiness. They found that the happiest people were the most orthodox religious believers and that the most confused and unhappiest were secular humanists and atheists. The uncertainty about God provided the most emotional confusion and misery.

That is why the liberals will lash out at the Tea Party in ways that reveal their own inability to deal with reality, because they live in a world of fantasy where they believe you can borrow and spend endlessly with no unhappy consequences. That is why Rep. Mike Doyle called the Tea Party terrorists — because they've made it impossible "to spend any money." Like a spoiled child, Mike Doyle is angry and having a tantrum because he can't spend any more of the people's money.

Liberals are only happy when they have other people's money to spend, and the more you give them the



Written by [Sam Blumenfeld](#) on August 8, 2011

more they will spend. That is why increasing the debt ceiling was not a very good idea. But too many Americans have also become addicted to spending by using their credit cards. Our consumer economy is built on the premise that everyone must keep spending as much as possible to keep the economy growing.

Can that mindset be changed? To some degree it has already been changed by the housing debacle, rising unemployment, inflation, and heavy debt. The chickens have come home to roost. The truth is beginning to sink in. There ain't no such thing as a free lunch, unless someone else is paying for it.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative,
non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.