

Political Correctness versus Freedom

A rant about being a victim of the political correctness police

by Kenneth A. Kuhn

Dec. 9, 2012

links to referenced essays are at the end

Introduction

Let me open with a quote from George Orwell, “Freedom is the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.” I am the messenger who tells people politically incorrect things that they do not want to hear because many are programmed (brainwashed) into following the party line. Because of a particular one of my many messages I have been excluded (blacklisted) from ever having any of my essays printed in a certain (and perhaps all) national print publication. So what follows is a rant about the whole concept of political correctness and its associated distortion of reality. It is impossible to make good decisions based on bad (however politically correct) information. However ugly reality might be it is important to understand reality in order that one might make decisions that could lead to an improvement. Political correctness has a shameful history of making problems worse. I want to see things get better. I am not afraid of the truth. Does seeking the truth make me a mean-spirited right-wing extremist nut? I think not.

I was rejected because it was determined that my political incorrectness is offensive to some. That is fine with me. If being politically correct is a requirement, then count me out – I want no part of that. I am not a dumb sheeple. There I go offending the general population. How do I speak the truth without offending? If I use nicey-nicey language then thinking people are offended. I can’t win. Maybe I should be like a politician and just say a bunch of impressive sounding nothings and let the problems perpetuate forever. I take pride in thinking for myself rather than being told what is acceptable to think.

Strike of the Political Correctness Police

My essay, *Voting Your Economic Stake*, was scheduled to be printed in a national print publication in October of 2012. An essay by someone else was substituted at literally the last moment two days before going to press because the editors discovered my politically incorrect essay/rant on my website, *The Economic Wisdom of Poor People*. That rant stated some things concerning rampant entitlement syndrome that many people with a bias towards political correctness do not want to hear. My rant was labeled offensive and in poor taste. The editors were afraid that some people reading my voting essay might discover my website and be offended and make some connection between the publication and my rant. I do not follow that weird reasoning but that is what I was told. As a result I am in effect black-listed from a particular national print publication. I must say that perhaps it is just as well as the draft edited version they sent me was incredibly horrible – hardly anything of my original was left and the presentation was very defocused. I had doubts about that thing being published with my name by it. I will keep the name of the publication to myself as I am not out to defame them. I regularly read the publication and will continue to do so as it provides me with valuable information that I use to make important decisions regarding investments. I hold no grudges.

Political Correctness versus Freedom

A rant about being a victim of the political correctness police

My reaction is that it appears that only particular excerpts were considered without a read and understanding of the entire piece thus leading to a false conclusion. But no matter – the deed is done and I am now another victim of the political correctness police. My following rant is not against them specifically but against all followers and imposers of political correctness for they are the ones who caused this situation.

The Economic Wisdom of Poor People rant allowed me to clear my mind of a lot of crap I have hear from people with entitlement syndrome that has highly offended me over the years. It felt good. I have been more at peace since writing that. The following rant is broad and again is intended to clear my mind of a lot of ridiculous crap that the “enlightened” keep ramming down my throat. I know I will feel better at the end and some of the thoughts are fodder for more in-depth essays that will come later.

The Clint Eastwood movie, “Million Dollar Baby” was a poignant story about a daughter from a welfare family who worked hard to escape poverty and became a very successful boxer with a high income – my kind of story – just what I believe in. There was a scene where she returned to her family to present them with a house she had bought for them so they could have a nice place to live instead of a run-down trailer. Her family (who happened to be white, not that that makes any difference) was dismayed and asked why she could not have just given them the money instead. Her mother commented, “When the government finds out they are going to stop my welfare. I can’t live without my welfare.” The daughter was shocked as an ugly reality had just sucker punched her in the face. In that scene Mr. Eastwood is expressing essentially the identical theme of my piece. Should Mr. Eastwood be blacklisted? I think not. I do not have to agree with every last thing he has said or done. I look at the aggregate and I find it very positive. So why am I judged on a single point? Why can I not be judged in the aggregate? I think I have some important things to say and that people need to seriously think about even if they take offense to my previous essay.

The Reverend Wright can say, “God Damn America” but yet not be blacklisted. Is my pointing out the truth more offensive than that? Apparently so. The population needs to wake up.

Over the years I have heard a number of public officials express an opinion only to be highly criticized for their political incorrectness, either direct or accidental. In some cases what was said was a classic case of foot-in-mouth disease which can easily happen after a long day of speaking. I have experienced such personally and tend to be very forgiving when that happens to someone else. Other times it is words taken out of context or juxtaposed to paint the person in the wrong way. I pay no attention to those falsehoods. But then there are the cases where the person has a definite opinion that ranges from either I do not agree to highly offensive (President Obama inferring “I did not build that” is a good example of offensive). Whether I agree or not or whether I take offense or not I believe that people have a right to express their thoughts.

By definition, political correctness means the expressing of something in a way that obscures or falsifies the truth so that the overly sensitive feelings of people unable to deal with reality are not hurt. Thus, a politically correct statement is always, as in one hundred percent of the time, an incorrect statement. It is pointless. Why would anyone waste their time with such? I challenge anyone to show me a politically correct statement that actually presents the truth.

Political Correctness versus Freedom

A rant about being a victim of the political correctness police

There are three kinds of people – those who made results, those who didn't, and a very small number of those unable to make results because of a real (not faked) disability – the last group is not part of any of the discussion in this rant so don't accuse me of speaking against them. There is no point in being concerned about hurting the stupid feelings of those who didn't make results. There is no case where politically correct, Namby Pamby nicey-nicey statements ever inspired anyone to strive towards success. Such concepts have a notorious record of holding people back that might otherwise have made it if only they had been told the ugly truth. Yes, the truth can hurt. Every person who is a success today had to face perhaps several ugly truths about themselves at some point in their past. The successful built on those truths. The failures just got their feelings hurt and did not try to succeed. I conjecture that most successful people would have been failures had they been told only nicey-nicey crap instead of the truth. Show me anyone who became a success and never had to face the truth. You can't. So stop saying that I am wrong and don't get it.

Liberal or Conservative?

It is not a question of liberal or conservative or left or right. The modern day definitions of those are so highly corrupted that the debate really swings on fascism (a concept that among other vile things puts the government in control of the economy for the benefit of special interests in the hypocritical name of “for the people”) versus socialism. Modern day liberals seem to be for increasing government domination and control while modern day conservatives are generally for minimal government. That is the opposite of what it once was. I am a liberal by the classical definition but am labeled an extreme right-wing conservative by the modern definition. The United States was founded on the classical definition of liberalism. I challenge people to think about the definitions in effect now. Many today that call themselves liberals are actually fascists or statists and oppose most classical liberal concepts. Many times I have encountered the pervasive assumption that somehow people classified as liberal are the educated (a.k.a. the “enlightened”) and those classified as conservative are the ignorant. I do not buy that. There are educated and ignorant people throughout all sides.

Sometimes I am accused of being a right-wing extremist conservative Republican nut. That is odd to me because I do not identify with right-wing extremists. My political views are Libertarian, not Republican. I do believe in small government and sound fiscal policies. But I also take the liberal view of freedom in its most general sense. I do not believe in the idiotic “nobody left behind” concept. I am anti-socialist, anti-fascist, and anti-statist but that does not make me anti-liberal although to the “enlightened” that immediate makes me an idiot. I am fed bullshit left and right. Consider the following.

I believe all people should be free from government domination and manipulation. I believe that all people should be free to do whatever they want within their own space – that is not violating the space of someone else. I remember in ninth grade civics class many years ago the instructor told us that our rights end where the nose of someone else begins. I have been told that that particular viewpoint means that I am really an anarchist. I don't understand but if not believing that people's lives should be controlled by some collusion of government, business, and religion

Political Correctness versus Freedom

A rant about being a victim of the political correctness police

means that I am an anarchist then so be it – I wear that title with pride. Whether someone's favorite activity is ingesting some substance or taking part in some activity most normal people would find offensive makes no difference – it is not my right to interfere with or control such actions done voluntarily in private. I don't have to like what people do. I do have to respect their right to do what they want – provided no one is being victimized. In such cases then I believe one of the roles of government is to be the protector of anyone who would be a victim. This does not sound like right-wing extremism to me. Perhaps I am wrong but I interpret that as quite liberal.

I do know for a fact from the laws of Nature that in every case it is absolutely immoral and an act of total stupidity for a government to assist someone who has abused themselves with whatever substance or activity. Some people are offended by my position. How offended do you think I and other good people feel at the concept of a government stealing under the guise of taxes our hard-earned money to dole out benefits to the worthless – and all substance abusers are worthless. I distinguish substance users from abusers as most any substance has a legitimate use (regardless of legality) for certain situations if properly used. Don't just make some jab statement like, "Ken just does not get it" and then run and hide behind mommy's skirt. If you think I am wrong then write an essay on the virtues and benefits to society of substance abusers – I would be interested in reading it. If you can't do that then shut-up. My observation about many of the "enlightened" is that they are too pussy to actually do anything – they just mouth off about how others are ignorant. Whether you believe in a God or not there are certain laws of Nature and violation of those laws results in death. Nature is not about compassion for the worthless. The true God of Nature intended for failures to die off in spite of "enlightened" concepts. If you do not like that then complain to Him, not me. That is reality however ugly and politically incorrect. Private charity is fine provided it is purely voluntary. Many people run their yaps about what rights they have. With rights come responsibilities – it is not a free ride. Few understand that these days.

Whether abortion is right or wrong does not matter – it is not my place to interfere. This is an interesting topic that does beg for discussion on where a line should be drawn – but that topic is outside the scope of this document – perhaps another essay will address that someday.

I am all for the separation of church and state as history is replete with horrific examples of what happens when the two mix. I find it hypocritical that many strongly advocate for this provided the separation is applied to religions not their own. To them it is perfectly alright for their own religion to be crammed down other's throats via government. Hypocrisy is rampant.

I am told by some that God created the Earth over the course of 144 hours (six days) roughly 6,000 years ago. I am not allowed to dispute that but I do anyway because the true God of Nature left strong evidence to the contrary.

I believe that the God of all of Nature designed evolution as a means to create life capable of surviving, even thriving, in an ever changing world. I am told that God created life specifically to be inadaptable to changing environments – only micro changes referred to as adaptation are allowed. Certain presumptuous self-appointed human deities absolutely forbid God to create and use a tool such as evolution to insure that life survives in the presence of both small and large

Political Correctness versus Freedom

A rant about being a victim of the political correctness police

environmental changes that are inevitable. Of course those same human deities forbid people such as me to question their wisdom. But I do anyway as I do not follow that official line either. Those same human deities proclaim that people should be free to think – provided what they think follows the official line. Non-followers are heathens that should be removed. Call me a heathen.

As a child I was told that if someone hits me on one side of my face that I should turn the other side to them so they could hit that too. I thought that concept was stupid then and I still think so today. I reckon I am just hopelessly ignorant.

A young person commits a terrible crime, say rape. The “enlightened” cry out, “What a troubled youth; he needs lots of rehab and society should pay a lot of money for him to go to advanced school.” I say bullshit to their stupid answers. What the youth needs is to have the hell beat out of him and then be locked out of society until he can prove that he is no threat. The “enlightened” tell me that there is no point in that as it does not reverse the deed and would not prevent one hundred percent of future situations. I say that the theory of consequences applies – such deeds tend to have minimal occurrence when the consequence of such deeds is known in advance. My way is a proven success. Their methods have been shown to universally fail. Yet I am the one who is ignorant.

Youthful vandals think their actions are cute. According to the “enlightened” the politically correct thing to do is for taxpayers to fund entertainment programs to these youths as an alternative to their actions. I say bullshit. These pathetic youths, who are failures at managing their free time, and clearly have too much free time should be put into forced outside work (working outside is good for you – I have done it) at least nine hours a day and six days a week for an entire summer. They owe a debt to society and this is a method to pay some of that debt. The debt is paid in time rather than money. Time is the great equalizer between rich and poor – all are absolutely equal. My concept gets me labeled as “mean-spirited” – even right-wing extremist. Clearly I do not understand the educated “enlightened” concept that rewarding bad behavior leads to less bad behavior. My solution is practical and is valid whether one is liberal or conservative so I do not understand the liberal-conservative debate on such issues.

I am of the belief that the only good criminal is a dead criminal. I know that is politically incorrect but I defy anyone to prove me wrong. Show me anyplace on this planet where criminals are an asset. It is not a liberal-conservative debate so I do not understand why I am labeled as wrong. Society does not have to actually kill or execute the criminal – only just remove them from society so that society can live in peace. If criminals are not in society then it is a moot point as to whether they are dead or not. So to the advocates who want to abolish the death penalty I am actually in agreement – mainly for practical reasons – the death penalty is lucrative for the legal profession – the current rate is around two million dollars per execution. It is much cheaper to keep them locked up instead – particularly if they are put to work doing something useful for society – as partial payment of an immense debt they owe to society. So-called rehabilitation of criminals is generally a waste of effort although exceptions may exist. Rehab is best done privately rather than via government. The best thing to do with criminals is to keep them removed from society and working to earn their keep. I know that is not the

Political Correctness versus Freedom

A rant about being a victim of the political correctness police

perspective of the “enlightened” but their ways have failed miserably at great cost to society over the years while my concept can’t fail. But I am the one who is ignorant.

The enlightened expect the prosecution at a trial to present a perfect case – even a simple typo should be reason to drop a case. I have referred to these particular “enlightened” as advocates for criminals. They deny that and again say that I just don’t get it. They are all for justice. They believe most people are wrongly convicted. They doubt DNA proves anything. They doubt any clear evidence is real. They advocate that taxpayers should hire the most expensive legal team for every criminal to all but insure an acquittal. This is another case where I think the “enlightened” are really just out to enrich themselves.

So why am I accused of being some sort of ignorant right-wing extremist nut? I know the answer. I do not believe in redistribution or the philosophy of entitlement (I have already stated that I am an anti-socialist). I also do not believe that it is right for government to discriminate against one group of people for the exaltation of another group particularly in the hypocritical name of fairness for all. Exalting the rights of one group can only come at diminishing the rights of others, i.e. me. I also believe that there should be no collusion between business, religion, and government. That sounds pretty liberal to me – especially in the classical sense.

I could go on with more examples that clearly show I am not any kind of right-wing extremist. But there is no point. I am not a left-wing nut either. I am just a rational person who thinks rather than subscribes to the party line – whatever that party is. Let me conclude this paragraph with a quote of my own, “If the only way to promote your cause is through lies then you do not have a cause.” I am fed a lot of lies.

Politically Incorrect Questions

I ask the questions the “enlightened” do not want to address for the true answers to such questions tend to expose flaws in their concepts. I know I am supposed to accept what I am told but I can’t – I have known too many people to lie to me. When I check things out for myself I often find that what I am told is bogus. Frequently it is a set of true facts but critical information is missing and other information has been juxtaposed to paint a crafty distortion of the truth – in other words a total lie – the concept of lying by telling carefully packaged truths.

I ask the question – why do blacks get special voting districts but not gays, lesbians, transgender, women, and a significant list of other minorities? Why does the voting rights act apply only to specific states and not all states? Isn’t that unconstitutional? Are some people more equal than others? Why can’t all minorities have special rigged voting districts? I thought things are supposed to be equal and fair for all. Apparently fair is determined by who has political power. I must be ignorant.

I look at the voter ID debate and I clearly see that the debate of blaming Republicans to stifle Democratic votes is a ruse to hide the fact of election control of Democratic political machines operating in various rural areas and even portions of big cities. These are areas where Republicans for all practical purposes do not exist so stifling Democratic votes is a moot point.

Political Correctness versus Freedom

A rant about being a victim of the political correctness police

The real point is to insure that a machine member is elected by whatever means – fairly or via fraud. The real fraud that is much easier to do is in absentee and early voting ballots so the whole voter ID debate is rather pointless. Election fraud has existed for a long time in scattered localized areas although as a percentage of the national picture it is likely small. But telling the voters in an area dominated by election control that on a national scale that fraud is minimal is a high insult.

The recent issue (2012 presidential campaign) concerning a large portion of the population not paying taxes brought out all sorts of analysis to show that in fact these poor people do pay significant taxes to subsidize low taxes for the rich. Except that they don't. I look at the real numbers and calculate actual taxes rather than accept hypothetical presentations. I ask to be shown the numbers and all I get is that the poor pay way above their "fair" share and the wealthy pay way below their "fair" share. "Fair share" is a nice nebulous concept that the "enlightened" love to use to hide from reality. I am mean spirited for pointing this out. Many people complain (and I am not in disagreement on this point) about countless tax loopholes for the wealthy, either individuals or businesses. However, I have pointed out that the biggest tax loophole of all that dwarfs the loopholes for all the wealthy and businesses combined is being middle class and below. It is true – check it out for yourself. Few people understand that for my statement implies that more people depend on subsidy than realize it. That offends them for they like to think of themselves as productive (and they may very well be) and that it is others who are free-loading. But no, hidden welfare via tax loopholes enables them to enjoy a standard of living beyond what their production can support. Some people ask what is wrong with me? Why don't I understand that this is a great concept – the American Dream? My answer is that it is not sustainable. It is based on theft. The day will come when the money to subsidize that will be gone. Then what?

It is no democracy for the non-taxpayers to vote to increase taxes on the taxpayers. That concept is what has led the United States into the financial mess it is now in and we all know or should know the stupidity of continuing failed actions while expecting successful results. I demonstrate how the progressive tax concept led to this in my essay, *Failure of the Progressive Tax*.

The presentation that Republicans are against paying taxes is bogus. Wealthy Republicans and wealthy Democrats too tend to live in the highest tax areas. Why? Because high taxes as well as high prices are filters that keeps the crap out so they can live in tranquility. That is local tax which is often better spent than Federal tax. It is generally hard to find anyone who actually pays taxes to complain about government needing money to do the tasks we expect government to do even including social investments. The issue comes up when taxes are a rouse to expropriate money from those who earn it and dole it out to those who don't. What is wrong with being against that concept? That brings us back to it is not a lack of tax revenue problem, it is an excess dole problem. All we hear today is that the government needs more taxes – taxes for what? The answer is not given for truth is that it is for increased dole – not a function of government. The fine print behind the "generosity" of Democrats wanting to raise taxes is that the target of the tax increase is someone else. I see and point out the hypocrisy. I know that is politically incorrect but I can't live in a world dominated by lies.

I have heard some people say that it is okay for someone to shoplift or steal food if they are hungry. This makes absolutely no sense. There are numerous aid organizations that address the

Political Correctness versus Freedom

A rant about being a victim of the political correctness police

issue of hunger. Presumably, these thieves are actually very decent hard-working people too proud to ask for a handout. Think about what a stupid concept the previous sentence represents – decent people are thieves. No, decent people know all about the aid organizations and know to seek help prior to the need becoming a crisis. This is a concept of what I refer to as misguided compassion disease – when people are ruled by emotion rather than sense. Of course, I am mean spirited and uncompassionate, and just do not get it when I point this out.

I always ask the question, “Where are all the unemployed men?” every time I hear that women are paid only about two thirds the salary of men – craftily implying but never specifically stating that it is different jobs that are being compared. What I find interesting is that the fine print in those presentations is actually true – that men and women work very different jobs with different pay scales – a liaison between engineers is not performing engineering and should have a lower pay scale – no matter how crafty verbiage might be used to make the general public think the two jobs are identical. But the presentation is craftily cast to lead the reader to conclude that it is an identical job to identical job comparison. As I have pointed out in another essay, *Salary Myths Concerning Women*, if that were actually true then corporations would be dumping men right and left, hiring women and saving a bundle on salaries for the same work. But I am classified as some sort of extremist nut who just does not get it by daring to disagree with the mainstream thoughts of the sheeple (There I go again – offending the truly intelligent people of our society. I am just a basket case.).

Why would a city council (Birmingham, AL in 2012 as an example) pass a moratorium on new business licenses for payday loan outfits in the hypocritical name of protecting the people from this “scourge” (and I agree completely with that description) when to any thinking person the obvious reason is to stifle competition as requested to the council by existing payday loan businesses? Isn’t that fascism? I must be ignorant as I am told that I just do not get it. If the council was so concerned then why did they not include a moratorium on renewal of existing licenses too? If they had then I could understand as that would be a consistent position. Whether government should favor or disfavor various businesses brings up questions of whether one believes in freedom or fascism – not a topic for the present discussion.

I hear such bullshit that Wal-Mart pays its employees so little that they cannot afford to shop there implying that those poor employees have to shop somewhere else. Would someone please tell me where else they shop for if those stores have lower prices than Wal-Mart then I want to shop there too. I am not interested in debating whether Wal-Mart under or over pays its employees. My point is that making impressive accusations does not alter the facts. Perhaps I am wrong but I thought one of the benefits of working for Wal-Mart was the employee discount. If other stores can top that then why does Wal-Mart do so much business? I listen to my brain rather than the rectum of someone else.

How come it is that only people who vote Democratic have issues in casting their vote? At every election I keep hearing how unfair the system is to them. They always seem to miss the well-known cut-off dates for registering. They seem to have trouble with any kind of identification. Interestingly, they seem to have no problem with identification when entering government buildings to apply for benefits – could there be some lie taking place?

Political Correctness versus Freedom

A rant about being a victim of the political correctness police

Why is it that the people who earn something are called greedy and the people who lust after what those people have are called needy? I ask this question but the “enlightened” never provide and answer other than I just do not get it. I have never heard any evidence that the “enlightened” know anything.

I was once told (an unedited, literal quote that stuck in my mind because of its absurdity), “The poor have to work three full-time minimum wage jobs just to pay the light bill.” This may very well be the official party line story but it is so far beyond the realm of reality that it should be small wonder that I would classify it as bullshit. But when I make that classification then all of the sudden I am insensitive, I am greedy, I am mean-spirited, I am offensive, and I am ignorant and just don’t get it.

I am told that diversity of thought should be encouraged and I agree completely – except that my thoughts are excluded from that diversity because I am clearly wrong. Only thoughts that follow the official party line can be part of the accepted diversity. So that is what diversity means.

I keep being told that the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer. I have labeled such statements as bullshit and one hundred percent of the people who make such statements are ignorant of the facts. I ask the question that if such is true then how does one explain the existence of a middle class? The statement is about diversion from the middle. All those above some level are getting richer and all those below that level are getting poorer. The natural end is nothing in the middle and only population at the extremes. Yet that is clearly not happening. I ask where the line is but no one can tell me. So the statement is proved false. But never let facts get in the way of a good slogan for the sheeple.

A couple of years ago my mother’s house was ransacked by two teenagers from welfare families. Oh I forgot, I am not supposed to say that because I am told that such does not happen – it must be evidence of my right-wing extremism – the real perpetrators would have to be from the evil non-working rich who go around stealing from everybody all day. Well, it does happen. I live in the truth, not denial.

How can I be considered free if I must conform to “official truths” regardless of the facts? Unlike many I do not have the luxury of ignorance to be a sheeple following the official party line.

Entitlement syndrome

There is a huge difference between making a social investment that enables people to become productive citizens and enjoy a certain quality of life as a result and subsidizing people to remain at a low level – a concept that leads to entitlement syndrome. I am all for wise social investment. I and probably everybody has been a beneficiary of such. All of us who benefited from public education worked to make the investment pay off for us and society. Others squandered the benefit and now expect to receive money transfers from those of us who worked hard. There are other examples of social investment have worked very well when properly used. In a sidebar in my essay, *The Trillion Dollar Scandal* I presented the proper and improper use of public housing

Political Correctness versus Freedom

A rant about being a victim of the political correctness police

as a social investment. What I do not understand is that if these social benefits are available to everyone and a significant number of people utilize the investment to better themselves then why do those who squander the benefits feel that they are owed? Are they better than us? What makes them special? No one ever gives me an answer other than I just don't get it.

Do not confuse social investment with socialism. In social investment the person is receiving a temporary assist to enable them to accomplish something provided they work at it. It is identical to the concept (as proven in Nature) of a parent nurturing offspring in preparation for them joining a self-sufficient society. It is a benefit that is only of value if it is earned. In this situation the earning comes after the benefit but that sequence becomes moot over time.

In socialism the benefit is bestowed whether earned or not. It becomes very easy to just enjoy rather than earn the benefit particularly if there is no social stigma to being a parasite. It is small wonder that most socialistic societies around the world are imploding under the burden of providing ever increasing benefits to a growing population of parasites. There are a few places where socialism is holding its own primarily because there is significant social stigma to being a parasite. I predict that after another generation that even those places will implode too as it is human nature to be lazy – particularly if it is easy.

The advantage of socialism to various business types is that subsidizing people to remain at a low level creates a lot of profitable business. It is small wonder then that those wealthy business types are in favor of higher taxes on themselves and others so that more money can flow through the poor to them. That is not hypothetical, I have heard it discussed. The hype in the media that these poor people need the money, and that we should be a charitable society and give to them, goes beyond charitable concepts and becomes a cover for wealth transfer to the rich providers.

I find it very interesting that every time (and I do mean every time literally) I complain about welfare for the lazy there is someone who brings up the sad story of a person who suffered some cataclysmic event and desperately needs charity. This juxtaposition of the truly needy with laziness is then used to prove that I am wrong. I have always made a clear delineation between those with legitimate needs of charity and those with entitlement syndrome who expect or even demand to be given the things they want because they are owed. This type of juxtaposition is common in a lot of debates and easily trips the unthinking. I am very sensitive to juxtaposition and when it is used you can be sure that lies are being used to build a case. Remember what I stated previously about using lies to build a case.

If the poor became smarter the business world would have less to sell. Charity is not about subsidy. Charity is about opportunity. But charity is wasted if the person receiving it does not do their part in utilizing the investment. I am afraid that charity has turned into a perpetual event where many recipients plan on charity for free stuff. How do we distinguish the truly needy from the parasites? One problem with charity is that the moment it is handed to the truly needy that the parasites only looking for a free ride show up in droves. I think charity is best when it is locally done and managed. I am very leery of statewide or national charitable groups as the top executives are often paid six and seven figure salaries – it may not be that big a percentage of the total volume but it seems hard to justify and even offensive – especially when the majority of the people making contributions earn much less.

Political Correctness versus Freedom

A rant about being a victim of the political correctness police

There is the well-known parable about giving a person a fish and you have fed them for a day. But teach that person to fish and you have fed them for life. Sounds good. I agree as that is a prime example of social investment. But what if the person learns that all they have to do is beg for fish and someone will give them a fish pretty much every day for life? What if after receiving fish for some time that that person figures out that they are owed a fish a day from society? What if that person and others join together and cast a majority vote that society does in fact owe them all a fish a day? This situation is known as entitlement syndrome and was the subject of my politically incorrect rant about such people that got me blacklisted. The preceding has already happened and demonstrates a concept in Democracy that few understand. Democracy cannot work if the voters are not themselves paying for the government they want. I addressed this in greater detail in my *Voting Your Economic Stake* essay. That is a major flaw in our system that needs to be corrected. It will take a major re-education of the public.

One concept that really irks me is bogus analysis that purports to show how regressive taxes are and that the poor are heavily taxed while the wealthy are highly subsidized. Interestingly, a common complaint among these various “enlightened” advocates is how unfair the tax system is to those who pay little or no tax is that they don’t get big tax deductions like real taxpayers do. One example that is pointed out by the “enlightened” is that upper incomers get a tax deduction on their part of a company sponsored health plan while the low incomers (who do not make enough to pay much if any tax) get no deduction. However, the taxable income (the income that is used to determine benefits) is reduced by the deduction amount which can lead to enhanced benefits (benefits inversely proportional to taxable income) – so the “enlightened” have it wrong. The tax code is very complicated and not within the scope of this piece but to be complete I will point out the resulting lower taxable income could actually reduce some benefits in some situations (EITC is one example where this could theoretically happen although I believe it would be hard to find an actual case). If the poor actually paid the taxes that the “enlightened” credits them with, then they would be benefiting from the deduction and this would not be an issue. The poor receive an incredibly good deal on life in the United States. They enjoy many benefits for free or almost no cost that the rest of us pay for – and particularly in the case of infrastructure benefits (for everyone) there is nothing wrong with that. To say that they are paying some kind of excessive amount for these is absurd to the max. I will point out that most any issue that purports that the poor are getting a raw deal can be shown to be craftily missing important facts – i.e. the presentation is a lie.

The “enlightened” often make the case that only a small amount of Federal money is spent on any particular social program – therefore claims that these programs are draining the country economically are false. What the “enlightened” say is true but with one important detail craftily missing – it is not any one program – it is the collection of all the programs.

Much is made of how many people live below the poverty line. Few understand that the incomes reported are only those earned and do not include massive government benefits. I have heard the question asked, “How do these families live on such a pitiful income?” The answer is their real (but not counted) income from benefits is much higher. Am I mean-spirited for pointing this out? Why is it that the truth is mean-spirited and lies are proper?

Political Correctness versus Freedom

A rant about being a victim of the political correctness police

If the United States is such a bad place for them to live then why don't they pack up and move to a better place – I hear that Cuba, North Korea, and a number of other places are utopias for low income people as the government provides everything for free. There is a huge hypocrisy taking place on this point and I am tired of it. But I do not see anyone rushing to move there. Why?

A number of people strongly disagree with me. But they typically are unwilling to either contribute or pay the truly higher taxes that would be required of them to actually support their cause. In short, those people are generous with other people's money, not their own. They are willing to pay a small amount that they extrapolate into a large "fair share" amount but far short of the true amount needed. That is the hypocrisy I keep pointing out. I think the real motivation of the "enlightened" is to find a means to live off of the rest of us.

The truth about wealth redistribution

I believe according to the God of Nature that all creatures were intended to be self-sufficient. Voluntary charity is fine for situations where compassion is appropriate but I see forced or coerced charity as an evil of a government with too much power – particularly when government charity is a means of enriching certain business types who collude with government. I find the concept of the government taking my efforts and doling them out to those who do not work for the purpose of those people voting a certain way to be highly offensive.

Eliminating poverty is not what it is about. It is using poverty as a means to transfer wealth to business people selling goods to those receiving benefits. In spite of the trillions of dollars spent on anti-poverty programs over the last fifty years it was recently reported that poverty in the United States is at an all-time high. But a lot of money has been made servicing the poor.

Be wary of wealthy people advocating for high taxes. It is more likely than not that the motivation is higher riches for themselves. The typical case is that they are in a business that profits from government handouts to the population. Every dollar extra they pay in taxes when spread over many others also paying higher taxes may mean many dollars of additional business. In short, they are generous with other people's money. This point is not well understood by the general public and the beneficiaries want to keep it that way.

Taxes are no longer about running government but about distribution to non-taxpayers. Excuse me – I am told that the non-taxpayers pay the highest taxes and that it is very offensive for me to refer to them the way I do. The problem we have is not a lack of tax revenue – it is excessive spending (doling is a more accurate description). If all doling were removed from the budget then taxes could be significantly reduced and the budget would also be balanced. But that sane concept can't work anymore because too much of the system now depends on ever growing debt. It is not possible to tax our way to a balanced budget. It is also not possible to cut our way to a balanced budget. And no combination of the two works either. The only other option is building higher taxes into prices we pay for goods but that option has been shown not to work either in other countries. All we can do is go ever deeper into debt until the day comes when we can't. I truly look forward to hearing what solution the "enlightened" will come up with then. I already

Political Correctness versus Freedom

A rant about being a victim of the political correctness police

know – the same standard answer – those of us who managed our money and resources well are the cause of the problem because we just don't get it – we should pay for the solution.

If redistribution is such a good thing then why isn't wealth redistributed to me? I never have asked for such and do not believe I am owed anything other than the opportunity to make wealth for me. But by the same reasoning I do not understand why I am forced to pay so that a certain political party can buy elections and enrich themselves selling products to the people that receive what was my money. And then those same advocates who use the poor as a pass-thru agent to end up with my money in their pockets have the audacity and hypocrisy to call me greedy.

I do not understand why a certain political party passes laws to pick my pocket and dole out the proceeds to their charities and then calls me greedy. I have to fund my own charities and it would take five digits to the left of the decimal place to total how much I have given over the years. Is it any surprise that I never vote for that party after decades of them offending me with their rhetoric? They get the credit for being generous with my money while I am credited with being greedy for earning it (excuse me – I have already been told that I do not earn anything – my money is money I just lucky enough to have). I am not supposed to be offended by this. But if I object and point out the truth then that is very offensive to others. I reckon I am too ignorant to understand the “fairness” of that.

I am told that I owe a debt to society. I am told that the harder I work the greater the debt I owe. To whom do I owe this debt to? How did I incur this debt? When I ask the question, “If I am paid \$100 for doing yard work for someone then how much of that do I owe someone who collects welfare checks? No one will give me an amount but they will tell me that I just don't get it – the standard answer for most any issue put to the “enlightened”. If the “enlightened” are so smart then why can't they give me an answer I can use?

There are some who call for periodically to confiscate from all and redistribute equally to everyone. The theory is that this gives those with lower economic means an opportunity to make it big. Also, those who just have wealth (i.e. did not earn it) will be put down to their proper place. It sounds nicey except that it is impossible for such a concept to work. If everyone knows that if they work to get ahead that that will be taken from them and if they don't work then wealth will be handed to them, then only the absolute stupid will work. The end result is that the economic pie keeps shrinking and everyone receives an ever smaller, albeit equal, piece. It is true that such a system will bring about equality so technically it is a successful concept. It is just that zero equaling zero is of no use to anyone.

Do not tell me that the wealthy are greedy. It is their high taxes plus money printed out of thin air by the Federal Reserve (a private bank with private stockholders not affiliated with the government contrary to popular “knowledge” – check it out) that pays for the benefit of everyone else. A surprising number of people in the United States would starve if not for the high taxes paid by high incomers. Few understand that.

Much is made of the so-called income gap between low-incomers and high-incomers. The gap is greatly overstated and even a bogus apples-orange comparison as it compares the pretax income of those at the high end with the pre-benefit income of those at the low end – that is always a

Political Correctness versus Freedom

A rant about being a victim of the political correctness police

wrong comparison. The value of all benefits received (which can be quite significant in total – into the multiple five figure range left of the decimal point) by law cannot be used to reduce eligibility for other benefits. Thus, although to my knowledge this extreme example does not happen, it is theoretically possible for a family making minimum wage and receiving \$250,000 annually in benefits to be classified as living in extreme poverty. Yes, I know that is an absurd example – I use it to expose the absurdity of the accounting – insert any other lower figure and the absurdity remains. My complaint is that the accounting system for reporting incomes at all levels is highly distorted. It gets back to my earlier statement about lying about one's cause. Why can't the truth be told? Even middle-class net incomes are actually higher than reported. I think that is part of the answer – the middle class wants to believe that it is self-sufficient and paying high taxes. The reality is nowhere near that – although it is not their fault, the middle class are the new subsidized class created by government policy to be dependent on government subsidy. Exposing the truth would be painful for many people. When I point this out I am told that I do not get it. People become mesmerized by the emotion of how pitiful things appear to be. Emotion is never a substitute for knowledge. But no matter – I am the one who is labeled as mean-spirited and uncompassionate.

Just as cancer and other diseases stupidly kill their host (thus leading to their own demise) with greed so are the entitled class killing the society that feeds them. What will the entitled do when society is gone? Perhaps then they will get what they truly deserve. What will the “enlightened” do then?

Why must I pay the price for politician incompetence and malfeasance?

One concept I find highly offensive is President Obama and a host of others at the national, state, and even local level saying in effect, “Because government has overspent and has become too indebted that those in our society that have run their personal financial affairs competently must reach into their pockets and bail us out of this mess.” Sadly, many moron sheeple in the population think that concept is great and just. Those sheeple are too stupid to understand that what is being described is a euphemism for wholesale theft so that the greedy sheeple can continue to receive expansive government benefits – until there is nothing left to steal. I realize that again, I just offended a large portion of our population. But I am right. I am not the one who created the mess. I am just the messenger who is pointing it out. Because I have not been brainwashed by the system I am viewed as offensive, uncompassionate, greedy, and a host of other negative adjectives. I am right period. I defy anyone to prove that continually bailing out a hopelessly corrupt government leads to a great society.

We are doomed if the concept of the government taking from the successful to bail out the failures is true. There is no point in saving or making any plans. Whatever you do will be confiscated by crooked politicians. Such a concept is justification for revolution and execution of politicians.

Political Correctness versus Freedom

A rant about being a victim of the political correctness police

The failure of government “help”

Over the years our government has “helped” us in so many ways. Beginning in the 1930s the government began its assault to drive the price of housing up in the name of making housing more affordable. No matter that prices were rising fast – the government made it easier and easier to go ever deeper into debt in the name of affordability. Many sheeple thought they were benefitting from this. The housing collapse of 2008 was the pinnacle of those programs as I documented in my essay, *The Trillion Dollar Scandal*. Going to college used to be affordable to the masses and without incurring debt. Then government stepped in to help. Now with all that “help”, college costs are astronomical and still rising. A student loan debt crisis is building just like the housing debacle. The newest “help” is via the Affordable Care Act. So, I would expect health care expenses to go down in coming years – yeah, right. The list of government “help”, i.e. manipulations (a.k.a. fascism) of the economy is very long. Not all are losers. The beneficiaries are the wealthy types behind government who push for these programs in the name of giving the average person a chance against the “evil” wealthy. And the sheeple buy it.

At one time government was an ally to the common person and this country had unprecedented growth. Now, government is the chief impediment to growth. I try to point these things out but I am practically labeled a lunatic by the sheeple who blindly accept the party line. The sheeple are easily misled.

The “luck” of doing the right things

I am told how lucky I am that I worked both smart and hard and have saved a small amount of wealth (ignoring that I actually earned it) to retire on. I am then told that I should share that with those who were not lucky in the name of fairness. I am told that luck is the only difference. Those people, who dropped out of school, did drugs, and generally wasted their lives are equal to me or anybody that stayed in school, avoided drugs, and dedicated their lives to success except that I am one of the “haves” and they are among the “have-nots”. I am not supposed to be offended by this. But others take offense at my objection to their greedy concept. So the problem is with me, not them. I have to call bullshit on this concept no matter whom that offends. I defy the “enlightened” to show me a welfare state in Nature. All right, I realize that those people are entitled so there is no such thing as a welfare state and what I am saying is totally bogus. Entitled means that they are owed what is rightfully theirs – just for being born and not applying themselves. So then show me an entitlement state in Nature. If you can’t show me that then shut up.

I am told by the pseudo-intellectual “enlightened” that my efforts in making wise investments in the stock market that have hugely paid off for me is just pure luck and no different than gambling. I have written (see my essay, *Investing versus Gambling*) on that topic and have explained a very clear difference. Sadly, many people have been duped into believing that gambling and lotteries are their easy ticket to riches. I do not have proof but I strongly suspect that it is the “enlightened” who are doing the duping for the personal financial benefit. Others just repeat the party line.

Political Correctness versus Freedom

A rant about being a victim of the political correctness police

Actions, not rhetoric

I have often wondered why the “enlightened” do not use their money to start a Nicey-Bank that makes loans and then forgives them. Or to use their money to setup a gas station to sell cheap gas, etc. Why don’t they open a discount store called Nicey-Mart and pay employees \$35 an hour plus full benefits and sell merchandise at the lowest price and beat Wal-Mart? I have heard complaints concerning the pay at fast food places – how can a burger flipper support a family of four on his/her meager salary? The obvious answer is for the advocates of higher pay to open competing food operations, say called Nicey-Burger, and pay enough to support a family and charge low prices and drive those greedy capitalists at Burger King® and similar out of business.

Many complaints are levied against pay-day loan operators for the high fees and interest rates they charge (and I am not in disagreement – those are sleazy operations). In the past I have posited that why not those who advocate that someone should do something about pay-day loan operators to open their own competing companies – say called Nicey-Loan and charge fair rates (whatever that is) and still be profitable. The competition would drive all operators to lower their fees thus benefiting the poor. My concept is to educate those who are educable to manage their financial affairs better so that there is no need to use such businesses.

There are countless more examples of where people say that someone should operate business a certain nicey way for the benefit of society. But no one (particularly the advocates) ever does these things. Why? Any of the examples would be monumental money losers. But when I try to point that out I am told that I just do not get it. I am ignorant. I am not of the “enlightened” class. I would seriously consider joining the “enlightened” class if I would ever see them do, rather than only just run their yap advocating, any of the above and make money.

Demopublicans or Republicrats?

When I hear the popular talk about let’s elect a government to just take what the rich have, my thought is, “You stupid moron sheeple.” Are you so ignorant that you actually think you have control and that some popular political party is going to accomplish this for you? Wake up you idiots – the party of the rich, a.k.a. Democrats, own a vast wealth and are not about to give it up. They don’t give a damn about you – they just want your vote so they can continue their personal enrichment via government. And you dumb sheeple vote just as you are told. That is not democracy. Don’t accuse me of being pro-Republican for I subscribe to Libertarianism. Over the years the Republicans also have voted to increase welfare spending so that that government money can flow into their businesses too – they just do not get the credit or blame. Call it either Demopublicans or Republicrats, it is the same thing. I view the two parties as actually one party who merged years ago and conspires and colludes to keep there from being any credible third party threat to their riches. They work to keep the population polarized in order that the good times for them can continue. I don’t read conspiracy stuff – I don’t have time. I just open my eyes and observe reality. You can too – but you have to stop believing the bullshit you are fed. Wake up – I know it might be offensive to say that – but it is about time someone called it out like it really is.

Political Correctness versus Freedom

A rant about being a victim of the political correctness police

The American people have been conditioned over the years to believe that when things go wrong in the economy it is always a failure of capitalism and when things go right it is always the success of some government social action. Khrushchev was right. Provided it is called something nice sounding such as entitlements the American people do embrace Communism – a system that enables the rulers to impoverish, control, and manipulate the population in the process of amassing fantastical personal wealth beyond what any capitalist can imagine. Contrary to what we are told, Communism has always been fully democratic. All are free to vote for whomever Communist party member they choose. Americans are free to vote for Demopublicans or Republicrats who collectively, if not literally, are the one and only ruling Party. Americans now live in the USSR – the United States Socialist Republic. So if you are a gullible comrade, then cast your vote for whichever Party candidate you like. Then keep dreaming your fantasy that the Party is going to make your life better. You owe that to your rulers.

In Conclusion

While I am not yet physically forced to think the official part line I am shunned for not doing so. Technically I am still free but practically I am becoming a non-person, excluded from society whose concepts of fairness and just I find very hypocritical. That society is going to eventually implode and I have no desire to be a part of it.

If being “enlightened” means that I lose all ability to think logically and requires me to follow the party line then count me out. The mainstream media only presents information that has been sanitized to support the party line. Sometimes they slip and present the truth accidentally. Then there is a huge scandal. So do not blindly trust what you read in papers or see on television. The lies may be omissions of truths rather than pure lies. Anyone speaking out has to follow the party line in order to be heard by more than a few nearby. You must seek the truth for yourself rather than depend on others to deliver it to you.

I have had bullshit crammed down my throat for many decades and I am tired of it. I am tired of being labeled insensitive and worse when I complain. The more crap is rammed down my throat the more essays I will write that will be interpreted as offensive by party liners. I am not changing my ways as I am not a stupid sheeple conformist. In fact I think I will become a stronger advocate for reason as I know that annoys the “enlightened”. I think it is highly hypocritical for those who take offense at what I write to freely offend me. I am only the messenger of reality. Do not shoot the messenger. I did not start the war. I am just a victim who fights back so I am going to practice freedom period. I live by the laws of Nature rather than the dictates of self-appointed deities of humankind. Through the study of Nature that is all around us and freely available to all, I know for a fact that I am right period.

How offended do you think I feel knowing that there are millions out their lusting after what I have built? I know President Obama has said that I did not build anything. I would think that the people who did the actual building would be quite wealthy but yet the group of “builders”

Political Correctness versus Freedom

A rant about being a victim of the political correctness police

seems to be hopelessly on welfare. Why is it wrong for me to question why the “builders” are not wealthy?

I have never heard any answers from the elitist pseudo-intellectual “enlightened”. All they do is look down their pointed noses at what a pathetic underclass I am. I have accomplished much in life – Obama-ism notwithstanding. Where are their accomplishments?

So as I understand it I am only allowed to criticize the party if I structure my criticism in a politically correct way. That is another way of saying that criticism is prohibited. How convenient. If I am silenced in the national press, then so are others who look at reality. Perhaps that is why I read so little related to reality and so much related to bullshit. I finally have an answer to something that has puzzled me for years. This experience has given me a new understanding.

I have the freedom to my thoughts and to put whatever I choose on my web site. I don’t ask that you agree with me. But I do ask that you respect my rights as I respect yours. I will never seek to impose my positions on you. So to others out there who have been discriminated against for failing to meet political correctness standards, I feel your pain. I am not changing my position and I encourage you not to change yours. Together, we can fight the “enlightened”.

I believe in the original American Spirit that built this great country – a concept based on self-sufficiency and growth with government acting as the enforcer of laws so that little people are not trampled. The concept of property rights was a great contributor to the building of our nation. Sadly, the government seems to be moving in a direction away from property rights and eventually the average person will have no choice but to lease property from property moguls thus forfeiting any ability to save and build a future for their families. Few understand this.

The American system has not been perfect. But it is closer to perfection than any other system ever conceived around the world. The issue I have is that the current government of the United States has become corrupted by a mixture of socialism and fascism – the opposite of the original concept. In my essay, *The Trillion Dollar Scandal*, I called for the overthrow of our politicians and restoration of our Constitution. It needs to happen however politically incorrect that might be.

There are those who say that if I would soften my writings then perhaps more people would take note of my thoughts and might be persuaded. I say what is the point? There is plenty of such nicey-nicey verbiage from all sources and it has been absolutely useless in persuading anyone. Stupidity is repeating failed actions but expecting successful results. The point of my writings is to make people wake up and think for themselves. That is naturally going to be an uncomfortable process. But it is a necessary step towards altering the very bad course our society has been on for many decades.

This was a big load to get off my back. Now I feel better and can go on with life. In the future I plan to write a series of short focused essays on a number of points brought up here. To those offended by my writings I respectfully apologize for telling the truth. I am politically incorrect and proud of it.

Political Correctness versus Freedom

A rant about being a victim of the political correctness police

Links to other essays referenced in this piece:

http://www.kennethkuhn.com/investing/voting_your_economic_stake.pdf

http://www.kennethkuhn.com/writings/commentaries/economic_wisdom_of_poor_people.pdf

http://www.kennethkuhn.com/writings/commentaries/salary_myth_concerning_women.pdf

http://www.kennethkuhn.com/investing/the_trillion_dollar_scandal.pdf

http://www.kennethkuhn.com/investing/investing_versus_gambling.pdf

http://www.kennethkuhn.com/investing/failure_of_the_progressive_tax.pdf