**Original:**

<https://sudaca.pe/noticia/opinion/el-zoologico-del-terruqueo?fbclid=IwAR3iusFhiUtPzefP5W6t9afnnBg3zgKgbi8V-Ur5NvwD-3E0tGj9AD06jmI>

**Google Translate:**

**The *Terruqueo*[[1]](#footnote-1) Zoo**

When I hear someone say things like "Verónika Mendoza is *terruca*," my reaction depends on the respect I have for that person. And I am not referring to respect for her moral capacity, but to how much I believe that this person is guided by the search for truth.

If she is a person whom I consider intelligent, I tend to think that it is impossible for her to believe something so absurd. Surely, this person is very clear that Mendoza is not a terrorist, but for some reason it is convenient for her to spread that she is. Now, a lie does not necessarily imply affirming a falsehood, but rather it is about saying something contrary to what one believes to be true. Because of this, the liar has to be clear about what she really believes, in order to later hide it. In that sense, the liar shows a certain respect for the truth.

On the other hand, if the *terruqueadora* is not a very bright person, I do tend to think that she really believes that Mendoza is a terrorist. Unlike the liar, this person is not able to realize the obvious falsehood of this statement, or the damage to reputation that she generates. And yet in a sense the fool also has respect for the truth. She responsibly seeks information from reliable sources, and believes that she has indeed obtained them. And if her sources tell her that Mendoza is a terrorist, hey, well, that's it. There is nothing more to inquire. The problem is, of course, that she does not know that she has placed her trust in the wrong people. And worse, when she occasionally realizes that she has been manipulated, she is shocked and disappointed, but then goes back to the same channel and feeds on the same lies from the same sources. The fool is genuinely convinced, and that is why she is activated, suffers, becomes indignant, and argues vehemently. The damage she causes may be terrible, but in a way, she inspires pity. The medieval theologian Jan Hus is said to have exclaimed “Oh holy simplicity!” upon seeing an old woman devoutly approaching to add a small piece of wood to the fire where he was being burned.

There is also a third group, distinguished from the first two by their total disregard for the truth. I don't know what word to use to describe them. The British band Pink Floyd, in all their genius, calls unscrupulous liars *dogs*, and fools who follow them *sheep*. The thirds, they call *pigs*. For lack of a better term, I'm going to call them that way. In the case at hand, the pig *believes that she does not believe* that Mendoza is a terrorist. But when she is confronted with questions and facts, she ends up conceding that she is not really clear on it. Still, and this is the crucial thing, she does not bother to seek clarity, but deliberately continues to spread the statement that she doubts, for this suits her for some other purpose. The pig is at home in the mud of confusion.

Roger Waters, author of the lyrics of the songs in which this typology is developed, points out that the sad thing about the pig is that she behaves with the authority of a dog, and believes that they have really accepted her as a member of the group. But she doesn't know that she really is being manipulated, just like a sheep: *You’re nearly a laugh / You’re nearly a laugh / But you’re really a cry.*

My first idea for this column was not to focus only on *terruqueo*, but to apply these concepts to other absurd ideas such as 'the privatization of vaccines', 'Sagasti genocidal', or 'the Sinopharm vaccine is useless'. Due to lack of space, I will have to leave these practical applications as exercises for the reader.

[Note. The Pink Floyd album with these songs is the *Animals*. Harry Frankfurt, in his book *On Bullshit*, discusses this contrast between lies and disdain for the truth]
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1. I asked an American friend how to better translate this word. I decided not to do so, but the exchange I had with her may convey what we Peruvians mean by the term. I asked: “In Perú, when an alt-right moron calls leftists ‘terrorists’, we describe that action with the verb “terruquear” (which is a neologism). That’s because, although the word for ‘terrorist’ is ‘terrorista’, we actually call them (the terrorists) ‘terrucos’. In English, ‘Terruquear’ would be something like ‘terroristcizing’. What would be a better word for that concept?” My friend’s answer: “That's a good question. I can't think of a good, specific term that would be the equivalent of "terroristcizing". It's like a very specific kind of alt right conspiracy fear mongering. But there's also a joke in here somewhere about "antifapping". Mccarthyism/communist hunting also comes to mind as a term that would resonate with Americans who experience or witness this.” [↑](#footnote-ref-1)