

Assassination Porn and the Sickness on the Left

HOW TO END WAR PROFITEERING
INDIGO OLIVIER

BIRDS AREN'T REAL'S WAR ON FAKE NEWS
IAN BEACOCK

THE NEW REPUBLIC

June 2024



American fascism

WHAT IT WOULD LOOK LIKE

// A SPECIAL REPORT //

RUTH BEN-GHIAT / ROSA BROOKS / MAUREEN CORRIGAN
FEDERICO FINCHELSTEIN & EMMANUEL GUERISOLI / FRANCISCO GOLDMAN
JASON STANLEY / BRIAN STELTER / KIAN TAJBAKSH

by Victor Davis Hanson

If we were leftists and we were to use leftist tropes to

editorialize the recent attempt on Trump's life, then we would frame the assassination attempt in the following way:

We have witnessed for years blatant exceptions to the once common custom that we don't normalize the imagined killing of any president or presidential candidate and thus lower the bar of violence.

But the Left constantly makes Trump an exception.

Now, it as if the imagined killing of Trump had been mainstreamed and become acceptable in a way inconceivable of other presidents.

(Do we remember the rodeo clown who merely wore an Obama mask during a bull riding contest and was punished by being permanently banned by the Missouri State Fair authorities?)

So since at least 2016 there has been a parlor game among Leftist celebrities and entertainers joking (one hopes), dreaming, imagining, and just talking about the various and graphic ways they would like to assassinate or seriously injure Trump:

By slugging his face (Robert De Niro), by decapitation (Kathy Griffin, Marilyn Manson), by stabbing (Shakespeare in the Park), by clubbing (Mickey Rourke), by shooting (Snoop Dogg), by poisoning (Anthony Bourdain), by bounty killing (George Lopez), by carrion eating his corpse (Pearl Jam), by suffocating (Larry Wilmore), by blowing him up (Madonna, Moby), by throwing him over a cliff (Rosie O'Donnell), just by generic "killing" him (Johnny Depp, Big Sean), or by martyring him (Reid Hoffman: "Yeah, I wish I had made him an actual martyr.").

Or should we deplore the use of telescopic scope imagery, given that the Left blamed Sarah Palin for once using bullseye spots on an election map of opposition congressional districts, claiming that such usage had incited the mass

shooting by Jared Lee Loughner?

Yet, recently POTUS Joe Biden was a little bit more graphic and a lot more literal. In a widely reported call to hundreds of donors last week, Biden boasted, "I have one job, and that's to beat Donald Trump. I'm absolutely certain I'm the best person to be able to do that. So, we're done talking about the debate, it's time to put Trump in a bullseye."

"In a bullseye?"

At least, Biden did not go back to the full Biden beat-up porn of the past (e.g., "If we were in high school, I'd take him behind the gym and beat the hell out of him"/ "The press always asks me, 'Don't I wish I were debating him?' No, I wish we were in high school – I could take him behind the gym. That's what I wish.").

Then there is the question of the Secret Service and one's political opponents. Given the tragic history of the Kennedys, why in the world did the Biden administration not insist that third-party candidate Robert Kennedy, Jr. be accorded Secret Service protection? Because his candidacy was felt to be disadvantageous to Biden?

And why just this April would the former head of the January 6th Committee and 2004 election obstructionist Rep. Bennie Thompson (D-Miss.) introduce legislation ridiculously entitled, "Denying Infinite Security and Government Resources Allocated toward Convicted and Extremely Dishonorable (DISGRACED) Former Protectees Act" to strip away Secret Service protection for former President Trump and by this April current leading presidential candidate?

Had Thompson's bill passed, would that not have been confirmation for a potential shooter to feel his task was just made much easier?

But in a wider sense, if the common referent day after day on

the Left is that Trump is another Hitler (cf. a recent *The New Republic* cover where Trump is literally photoshopped as Hitler), then it seems reckless not to imagine an unhinged or young shootist believing that by taking out somewhat identical to one of the greatest mass murderers in history, he would be applauded for his violence?

So is their logic, shoot Trump and save six million from the gas chambers? After all, *The New Republic* defiantly explained their Hitler-Trump cover photo this way, "Today, we at *The New Republic* think we can spend this election year in one of two ways. We can spend it debating whether Trump meets the nine or 17 points that define fascism. Or we can spend it saying, 'He's damn close enough, and we'd better fight.'"

Well, *New Republic*, recently someone took you up on your argument that Trump was "damn close enough" to Hitler and so he likewise chose to "fight"—albeit with a semi-automatic rifle.

If ad nauseam, a Joy Reid is screaming about Trump as a Hitlerian dictator ("Then let me know who I got to vote for to keep Hitler out of the White House") or Rachel Maddow is bloviating about studying Hitler to understand Trump, then finally the message sinks in that a mass murderer is about to take power—unless....

Finally, the idea, if true, that bystanders spotted a 20-year-old on a nearby roof with a gun, a mere 130 years from Trump, and in vain warned police of his presence, is surreal. Is it all that hard for the Secret Service to post a few agents on the tops of a few surrounding buildings closest to the dais, or at least coordinate with local law enforcement to do the same?

That is a no brainer. Whoever made the decisions concerning the proper secret service security details for presidential events should be immediately fired.

First published [on X](#).