

Can We Compromise With The Left?

A liberal visitor to my blog says I'm a Hater for not wanting to "compromise" with the Left. But I'm not sure of what he means by "compromise."

Take, for instance, the case of a Democrat city councilman in Washington, D.C., who recently blamed an unexpected snowstorm on an international firm of Jewish bankers, "[the Rothschilds controlling the climate... to own the cities](#)". Well, all right—he did sort of apologize, after the public found out about his statement and blasted him for it. "I did not intend to be anti-Semitic," he explained [cue laugh track]. Gee, mister, you sure fooled me.

How are we supposed to "compromise" with him? The Washington Post tried to shield him by devoting more than half of its reportage to zany conspiracy theories put out by the Far Right. Well, they're not my conspiracy theories and I won't answer for them. I'm not interested in conspiracy theories. I focus on what leftids actually say and do, for everyone to see.

They want, for starters, to take away our Second Amendment right to bear arms—because criminals and psychos don't obey our current gun laws. That's like taking away banks because criminals and psychos rob them, or abolishing the Internet to prevent identity theft.

We've made all sorts of compromises here, never insisting on anybody's absolute right to obtain as many armaments as he possibly can, of as many different kinds as he can get. But the Left always demands more. Even with a total ban on private gun ownership, criminals and terrorists and crazies will still have guns. And decent, peaceful, law-abiding people won't.

That's not a compromise. It's just a raw deal.

How do we compromise on abortion? Allow it only on odd-numbered days?

Liberals send "gender coaches" into our first-grade classrooms to indoctrinate the kiddies on the ineffable wonderfulness of transgenderism. How do we compromise? Do it only when the schools are open? Or only with children whose last names begin with the letters A through K?

In 2016 the Democrat platform had a plank calling for the attorney general to "investigate" the newly-invented crime of "Climate Change Denial." Oh, well—it's only a very little piece of our First Amendment right to free speech; we can get by without it. So we'll compromise and let them do that, and maybe they won't demand any more concessions. This is the Neville Chamberlain theory of compromise.

Speaking of little pieces of the First Amendment, leftids would like to take away our right to a free exercise of our religious beliefs. Go ahead, tell me they don't: as in, you'd better design and create a custom wedding cake for our lesbian wedding, or we'll get the government to destroy your business and put you and your whole family into sensitivity training... until your mind is right. And don't let us catch you praying in public!

How do we compromise there? "Oh, all right—you can take away our right to free exercise of our religion, as long as you leave us the right to decide which reality TV shows we want to watch"?

Don't you love it when squishy, spineless Republicans implore conservatives to "reach across the aisle" to the Far Left Democrats? Every time we reach across the aisle, they pick our pockets; we're lucky if they don't steal our fingers, too. It's how we wind up incrementally giving up our freedom, bit by bit. They never demand everything at once: they nibble us

to death.

How many more pieces of our liberty can we be convinced to give away? When will the leftids tell us that's enough, they don't want any more?

Much better to defeat them utterly, put them out of business, and undo the harm they've done.

But when is the right time to compromise with the Left?

In one word: never.

I have discussed these and other topics throughout the week on my blog, <http://leeduigon.com/> . Why not stop in for a visit? A single click will take you there.