



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on September 24, 2025

Why Won't Dems Debate the GOP? It's Simple: They Know "They're Going to Lose"

There is an immutable rule of life that we ignore at our own peril. "If people cannot talk things out," it goes, "they're left to fight them out."

This comes to mind with an observation recently made by commentator Jesse Watters on why Democrats almost never debate Republicans.

"They're afraid to play us," he said, putting matters metaphorically, "because they're going to lose."

"Their ideas are dumb," he elaborated, and they know "we're going to wipe the floor with them."



Diy13/iStock/Getty Images Plus

Making the remarks on Tuesday's [episode](#) of Fox News show *The Five*, Watters was responding to statements made by liberal actor and producer Rob Reiner during a debate the latter and comedian/commentator Bill Maher had on civility in America. As to this, the following exchange occurred on a recent edition of Maher's *Club Random* podcast:

Maher: "[Refusing to debate] would make some sense for the Democrats if they had any power. But the idea of 'we don't talk to you when we don't even have the power'? Of course you have to talk to people."

Reiner: "Before you have the exchange, you have to agree on certain facts."

Maher: "No you don't."

Reiner: "If somebody says 'Two plus two is four' and the other guy says 'No, it's not,' how do you begin the discussion?"

Maher: "Because, Rob, that's a slippery slope.... If you start down that road of 'I can't talk to you if you believe this crazy thing [then how many people will ever make your 'cut?']"

Rationalization Over Reason

Reacting to this, *Five* co-host Greg Gutfeld chimed in first. He noted that it is Reiner's side, the "woke," who've *actually proposed* in recent years that 2+2 *can* equal five. (The understanding that it equals four is but [a product of "Eurocentric whiteness,"](#) the theory goes. The 2+2=5 bit is also part of a wider denial of objective reality.) Of course, Reiner was merely drawing an analogy. Yet it doesn't help your debating fortunes when you begin with an analogy that can become a laughable self-own. Perhaps, too, this is a good example of why the Left generally avoids debate.

Speaking of which, Gutfeld identified Reiner's comments as intellectual dishonesty, as self-deception.



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on September 24, 2025

“His rationalization there,” said the pundit, “is, ‘I don’t need to talk to those people who might prove me wrong, because we need to agree on something wrong first.’”

This is no joke. A personal anecdote bears this out, too. A decade ago I participated in [a radio debate](#) on the *Mildred Gaddis Show* on the subject of “white privilege.” I expressed the truth that it [didn’t actually exist](#) (and [buttressed my assertion effectively](#)). Well, my debate opponent, a black race hustler, was aghast. He never expected that any commentator, especially at the time, would so brazenly dispute this leftist orthodoxy on air. It was so foreign to him, in fact, that he made a very telling appeal during our debate’s latter half. To wit (I’m paraphrasing):

“Why can’t we just agree white privilege exists so we can move on [with the debate]?”

Was he confessing that he could only prevail if I accepted his flawed premises? You can decide.

It’s All a Pretext

Returning to Gutfeld, he stated that Reiner-like rationalizations ensure that leftists “won’t have to debate.” But debate replaced “violence,” he added. So what would take its place? “Just pure segregation where we just go our separate ways and never speak?” (secession?) he asked rhetorically. “Or do we settle things the old-fashioned way, shooting somebody?”

Oh, it’s not that leftists won’t debate at all, fellow co-host Watters proceeded to point out. In “California,” he said, “I’m watching two liberals debate on whether to talk to me or not...!”

Watters then drew a sports analogy. “The Democrats are a guy who only shoots jump shots, and they only play by themselves,” he stated. But when challenged by a Republican, they balk. “And then when they try to play, they can’t defend, they can’t dribble, they’re out of shape, and that’s what this is about,” Watters elaborated. “They’re afraid to play us because they’re going to lose.... Their ideas are dumb.... They know it, we know it, so they run away with the ball.”

In reality, though, Reiner isn’t all wrong: A (*worthwhile*) debate cannot proceed unless you agree on certain basic facts. As G.K. Chesterton once noted, for example, you can’t argue with a man who insists everything is just a dream. Fruitful debate rests on the acceptance of certain axioms; i.e., self-evident truths that require no additional proof. Examples are: I exist, you exist, reality (which is *objective*) exists and can be ascertained. That is, facts are real and can be grasped.

As is said, however, facts are stubborn things. Debate is unlikely when one side fears facts — trembles at *Truth* — because it has a super-glue-level emotional attachment to lies.

“Just the Facts, Ma’am ... or Is It ‘Sir’?”

It isn’t just on math that the Left advances $2+2=5$ notions, either. Consider the “transgender” agenda. Attempting to overthrow countless millennia of human understanding, leftists claim we can switch sexes essentially at will. They also claim it’s compassionate to facilitate such by giving even youths cross-sex hormones and, ultimately, mutilative surgery. These are extraordinary claims and, of course, extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence. But the Left won’t bring the receipts to the debate arena.

No, instead, they turn around and say, “I’m not going to discuss it.”

“And you’ll be canceled if you dissent from our newly minted orthodoxy.”

Or consider the Covid-19 situation. We were told it was a “novel” virus, basically unknown, and that we



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on September 24, 2025

were treading in uncharted territory.

Yet then we were also told, in essence, “Question the government narrative on this unknown, and we’ll make you unseen and unheard.”

Make any sense?

It does if it isn’t seeking Truth you care about, but seeking power and/or compliance with your passion-fueled, emotionally-appealing lie.

This is why something almost never mentioned is true: This phenomenon is *satanic*.

When someone reveals your error via debate (or otherwise), he is giving you the gift of greater knowledge of Truth. And he then has perhaps done you the greatest favor anyone could. For God is Truth, so bringing a person closer to Truth is bringing him closer to God. But, of course, those who hate God, or even just fear the concept, don’t appreciate that one bit.

Know this, however: When you stop talking, it’s only a matter of time before irreconcilable differences ensure you’ll start fighting. It’s a reality that only a God-delivered miracle can forestall.

For those interested, the cited *Five* video segment is below.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative,
non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.