

Shameless Stupidity

Posted by Eugene @ LessGovernment.com - January 2007

On January 7, I was e-assaulted by a [Yahoo! Answers](#) user erroneously calling himself "the truth." (At least, I will assume for now that the user was a male.)

Y! Answers is a public forum in which people post questions about anything and everything, and the community members then leave responses and comments. It's amusing and occasionally informative, but there are apparently some zealous individuals in the Religion & Spirituality section who are not only stupid in the extreme, but wholly unashamed of making complete fools of themselves.

"The truth" (hereafter known as TT) responded to a question about [glossolalia](#) in the context of speaking in tongues. His unbounded wisdom consisted of a cut-and-pasted blurb of evangelical tripe, which asserted numerous fantastic claims, such as:

"The truth is, speaking in tongues is the most intelligent, perfect language in the universe. It is God's language."

...and

"Well, where does tongues come from? It comes from Heaven! Tongues is the heavenly language."

Evangelizing on Yahoo! Answers irks me, because it is almost never based on fact, and TT's ranting is no exception. However, I've never once preemptively attempted to silence an evangelical. Religious zealots have as much right to post as anyone else. As such, so do I, and I replied to the question as follows:

Unlike the nonsense spewed by the poster "the truth" above, speaking in tongues truly does amount to nonsense. The speech patterns exhibited by typical tongue-speakers are on a level akin to that of a babbling toddler.

The broader term for that entire religious movement (not to be confused with a bowel movement) is Charismata.

<http://en.wikip...i/Charismata>

I have a friend who grew up in a charismatic church. Today he's an atheist, but strangely enough . . . he can still speak in tongues at will. Some "spiritual gift," no?"

(I have since been informed by the aforementioned friend -- [Tzar](#) -- that he wasn't even an active member in the charismatic church, yet he was still able to pick up on the "Heaven Tongue" with ease . . . and retains it to this day. But that's beyond the scope of this rant.)

Offended that I called him out on his bullshit by name, TT escalated matters. Rather than merely ignoring my message or editing his own response, he chose to contact me directly with a one-line ultimatum (unedited):

"watch it pal!"

When asked why, oh why was his underwear in such a putrid wad, he elaborated (again, unedited in all its apostrophe-optional glory):

"That's your opinion and you don't need to mention me in your answers."

The confusing question here is why, if he really believes what he posted, is he so pissed that I referred to what he said? Did it make him cry when I called his psychotic religious shit nonsense? Is he really so insecure that he feels a need to single people out in a public forum and attack them behind the scenes?

The exchange continued with a reply from me:

If you post bullshit in a public forum, don't complain when you're called out on it. If you want to proselytize without public critique, send a private message to the victim. Now go away and stop whining.

In true Christian fashion, rebuttal from TT was swift and godly:

*"go **** yourself moron you are very self centered" [.]*

I'm not sure if he censored himself or if that was done by the Yahoo! contact form, but it's nonetheless unbecoming behavior for someone who claims to be filled with the spirit of a loving God, isn't it?

WWJD, TT?

Anyway, the joke could have ended there. However, fucking with idiots is a favorite pastime of mine. Several pointless messages were exchanged, and I began to think TT lacked the intellectual fortitude to do anything but hurl insults. But at long last, things got interesting when he said:

"I bet folded money your [sic] a communist homosexual" [.]

Yay, politics! This I can do!

So just when I feared my brain would be sucked into the black hole created by TT's galactic-scale lack of intellect, I was able to interject:

"Actually, I'm an anarchist straight man, not that the two traits have anything to do with one another. And yes, I frequently put idiots who post in public through the proverbial ringer."

Dismayed and hurt, TT asked:

"Am an idiot because I posted fact?" (And I gave him points for actually using a question mark at the end of the sentence, even though the apostrophe was MIA once again.)

Never one to be vague, I clarified:

"No, you're an idiot because you posted a myth that you believe is a fact, and you have no qualms about dragging others into the same world of delusion. If I posted fanciful stories about an invisible man with magic blood whose followers speak a mysterious unintelligible language, I would fully expect to be regarded as an idiot."

TT: *"Are you implying the holy bible is a lie?"*

Me: **"No, I'm not implying anything. I'm stating unequivocally that your belief in charismata is belief in a myth. As for the Bible itself, it's a mixture of myth, opinion and history, and it is not inerrant."**

Unable to hang with that, TT then began feverishly scouring my profile for more verbal ammo and

came up with this:

"Your not a true anarchist because your arguing over a view that doesn't exist in your world" [.]

I still don't know what he meant by that. I can only assume he mistook "anarchist" for "antichrist." That still doesn't explain why I would've responded to being called a communist by saying, "No, I'm not a commie, but I *am* the Antichrist." But then I realize I wasn't dealing with a wholly rational person, so I haven't devoted too much time to figuring this out.

Following TT's confusion over what an anarchist is, I could have taken the opportunity to do a little evangelizing of my own -- you know, Salvation from Statism. In my defense, I made a half-ass attempt to educate the poor fool:

"An anarchist (as in anarchy, anarchism, etc.) is someone who does not believe in government or non-defensive force. It has nothing to do with religious beliefs (or the lack thereof).

Yes, I am an anarchist. See my website: <http://www.lessgovernment.com>

No, I am not the Antichrist, which in all likelihood falls into the myth category with your charismata."

Of course, he wasn't having any of it. He dejectedly replied and said I wasn't answering his question, and I told him he neither asked a question nor made any sense, because there is no mutual inclusion or exclusion between anarchy (a philosophy) and religious beliefs. Then I thought that perhaps he was again retreating and going back to the religious subject, in which he *did* ask a question (because I remembered the surprising question mark). I humored him:

"Your last actual question was, 'Are you implying the holy bible is a lie?'

My response was simple: Your belief in charismata is a belief in myth. That doesn't make it an outright lie if you really believe it, but it doesn't make it true, either. Same with the Bible as a whole. Parts of it are true, parts of it are not. Believe as you will. Mostly, it is opinion, poetry and fiction. It is a man-made collection of literature, and I do not believe there is anything 'holy' about it. If anyone ever has a notion to prove otherwise, I'm always open to empirical evidence."

He took a really long time to reply after that -- about thirty minutes, when previously his messages had been coming in angry waves, two or three at a time within moments of each other. When he finally did respond, he again changed subjects:

"From you 'I'm a libertarian individualist with heavy anarchistic leanings' You cant be both your a hypocrite."

What??? A fundamentalist zealot is lecturing me about what makes a libertarian or anarchist? Wow, I've seen it all!

"Anarchists operate within the framework of libertarian thought and always have, with exception to anarcho-socialists (a group I've never understood). Lysander Spooner, renowned libertarian author from the 19th Century, is considered by many to have been the first contemporary anarcho-capitalist.

There are libertarian statist, there are libertarian minarchists, and there are libertarian anarchists. You can subdivide those three groups even further, but they all hold the same core philosophical values. The differences come into play regarding how those values might be realized. I believe libertarian ideals can exist without a government.

Hypocrisy would be me trying to implement anarchism by running for office. Ain't gonna happen."

And then the kicker, the height of arrogance, the final, undeniable sign that someone has been intellectually crushed and has nothing with which to further bolster his bad premises and insane world view ---- TT said (UNEDITED):

"Go check your facts out on what an anarchist is. And then maybe we will have an intelligent conversation."

I *almost* laughed aloud after reading that, but the sad/hilarious ratio was 60:40, so I merely sighed and typed:

"I've been affiliated with anarchists and anarcho-libertarian groups for the last few years, so I've got a pretty good handle on what defines one. If your vision of anarchism is punk rock and rioting, you're sorely mistaken. Further, if your vision of libertarianism is the United States Libertarian Party, you are sorely mistaken twice.

And what is this conversation about, anyway? You jump my case for calling out your proselytizing. I demolish you in our exchange over that, so then you resort to insults and somehow wind up trying to tell me that I'm not really an anarchist. And that's really hilarious, since you apparently thought I was referring to something religious at first.

What else do you call someone who does not support the existence of government? Definitely not a communist homosexual -- but again, that's your business.

Learn to spell before insulting a man's intelligence."

Not to be outwitted, TT had one final surge, the essence of which can be found in these unedited lines:

"If there were any intelligence in existence with you to be insulted, that would be one thing. But, through your responses you have proven that none exist."

Over the years I have engaged in countless e-arguments, some of which have been cordial and/or amusing, but many have been pointless, heated and so lacking in substance that the Laws of Conservation *might* have actually been violated once or twice. The recent exchange with TT was all of the above. I can't say that I've ever before encountered someone so utterly stupid in every sense of the word, but who simultaneously displays the most vigorous self-confidence to the point of countering facts with insults and considering it an intellectual victory.

TT, if you ever read this (and I bet you will, because you seem the stalking type), I hope your willful ignorance and blindness to reality will ultimately lead to the blissful realm of mental oblivion that you so clearly seek. Godspeed, friend.