

‘villepinism’?

We have **previously noted** that, while the term ‘idiotarianism’ has several obvious disadvantages, we occasionally have to use it because there is no alternative with the same meaning in common use.

Now, a reader of **Woty Freeman's** blog, Kolya Wolf, has suggested a new term to replace ‘idiotarianism’, namely **villepinism** (and ‘villepinist’ to replace ‘idiotarian’), after the current French foreign minister, Dominique de Villepin.

A few notes on this proposal:

- We think the word should begin with a lower-case ‘v’ because de Villepin was not the originator of villepinism, only a prominent exponent. We capitalize ‘Stalinism’ and ‘Thatcherism’, but not ‘quisling’ or ‘boycott’.
- It is ‘villepinism’ and not ‘villepinisme’ because it is an English word. The French translation might well be ‘villepinisme’.
- Recall our definition: “systematically siding with evil without actually adopting the evildoers’ objectives” and then look at **this** description of current French foreign policy.

What do our readers think?

UPDATE: Do you think we need a new word for “idiotarian”? Vote in our **poll**.

Thu, 07/17/2003 - 00:33 | [digg](#) | [del.icio.us](#) | [permalink](#)

Excellent

I like it a lot! Very clever. Unlike idiotarian, it's not a term that can easily be subverted.

by a reader on Thu, 07/17/2003 - 09:09 | [reply](#)

I love it! Go go go...

I love it!

Go go go

by a reader on Thu, 07/17/2003 - 11:25 | [reply](#)

Silly villies

From another [post](#) by Woty:

Villepinists know that some ideas are morally invalid – but they do not realize that these sort of ideas can drive people [.....] they can't know that Islamic fundamentalism is an ideology that people live for and center their lives around. They think it is impossible for this to be the case, since it is clearly immoral and unreasonable to choose such a life

Interesting, huh?

by [Tom Robinson](#) on Thu, 07/17/2003 - 18:32 | [reply](#)

IDIOTARIAN: (n) 1. (archaic) ...

IDIOTARIAN: (n) 1. (archaic) An idiot. 2. Someone who has offended an idiot.

http://jessewalker.blogspot.com/2003_07_13_jessewalker_archive.html#105846354996467544

by a reader on Thu, 07/17/2003 - 18:53 | [reply](#)

New word for idiotarian

The term "idiotarian" exemplifies an ad hominem attack, and for that reason should be dropped. It has a despising/hateful/taunting quality, in common with all ad hominem attacks. "Villepinist" is too bound to the current situation and in a few years is likely to be forgotten. "Fool" is an old four-letter word that has fallen out of favor, and was often used like "idiotarian" has been used since 9/11. **It got a bad rap in the New Testament.**

http://www.gospelchapel.com/Devotions/10_97/devotion_10-13-97.html "Heedless" is a nice, neutral term, which, I think, captures the essence of the issue.

by a reader on Tue, 07/29/2003 - 20:08 | [reply](#)

what?

heedless is not neutral, it's bad. and no string of letters if *inherently* ad hominem.

-- Elliot Temple

<http://curi.blogspot.com/>

by [Elliot Temple](#) on Tue, 07/29/2003 - 20:30 | [reply](#)

Ad hominem

Nothing is inherently anything. I stand by my statement about what

sort of statement is ad hominem. Reasoning argumentation will often involve describing key points that the opposing side has ignored, as a way of strengthening one side of an argument at the expense of the other. Arguments ad hominem ridicule/put down/denigrate the other side, contributing only emotional energy/excitement to the discussion. Usage of the term "idiotarian" functions this way. Showing how the opposition is "heedless" of various points and then describing the relation of these points to the issue at hand is an entirely valid way of reasoning.

Example:SOLDIER #1:

Where'd you get the coconuts?

ARTHUR:

We found them.

SOLDIER #1:

Found them? In Mercia? The coconut's tropical!

ARTHUR:

What do you mean?

SOLDIER #1:

Well, this is a temperate zone.

ARTHUR:

The swallow may fly south with the sun or the house martin or the plover may seek warmer climes in winter, yet these are not strangers to our land?

SOLDIER #1:

Are you suggesting coconuts migrate?

...

I guess you could call finding fault with an opposing argument "bad" but then you would seem to deny the utility of argumentation reasoning altogether.

by a reader on Tue, 07/29/2003 - 21:04 | [reply](#)

sigh

idiotarian has an established meaning that is not ad hominem. heedless does not.

idiotarian refers to a certain politic philosophy. it helps facillitate communication between clueful people. it is not intended as an argument. it refers to the sort that side with evil, but do not want evil things to happen. that is a phrase with content. whether any given person *is* in fact an idiotarian is an open question, and calling someone one won't cut it when that's in dispute. but hell,

calling someone a democrat doesn't prove they are one either.
labeling people is useful anyway, cause it helps us communicate.

-- Elliot Temple

<http://curi.blogspot.com/>

by **Elliot Temple** on Tue, 07/29/2003 - 21:31 | [reply](#)

Gone but not Forgotten

"'Villepinist" is too bound to the current situation and in a few years is likely to be forgotten.'

Villepin won't be forgotten, anymore than Quisling or Neville Chamberlain was forgotten.

by a reader on Wed, 07/30/2003 - 14:39 | [reply](#)

There we go again

Arguing over words rather than substance. Make up a word and attach it to a meaningful descriptive sentence. It is done all the time. If it is a good word and the description sufficiently summarizes the issue the word will come to mean what it means. Wrongheaded.

by a reader on Sat, 10/11/2003 - 14:44 | [reply](#)

encourage thinking

Dear Friends,

I think villepinism is a dangerous term because it promotes thinking. Thus, I am for it.

It seems very likely that many people will read idiotarian and immediately suppose they know what it means. Whereas, with villepinism, some may be tempted to look it up, do a Google search, or find places where it is talked about.

Regards,

Jim

davidson@net1.net

<http://www.ezez.com/free/freejim.html>

by **planetaryjim** on Fri, 11/07/2003 - 03:24 | [reply](#)

A Reader

IDIOT, n.

A member of a large and powerful tribe whose influence in human affairs has always been dominant and controlling. The Idiot's activity is not confined to any special field of thought or action, but "pervades and regulates the whole." He has the last word in

everything; his decision is unappealable. He sets the fashions and opinion of taste, dictates the limitations of speech and circumscribes conduct with a dead-line.

A.B.

The Devil's Dictionary

(although, in 1906 they made him call it the Cynic's Wordbook, because they were idiots).

by a reader on Wed, 09/29/2004 - 03:30 | [reply](#)

Don't use a current figure. P

Don't use a current figure. Perhaps something like chamberlainist would be better.

by a reader on Sat, 06/18/2005 - 11:52 | [reply](#)