

Leftist Lexicon Word of the Week

To be honest, the Internet is as safe as a meth lab housed in a nitroglycerin factory on the San Andreas Fault. Although I'm exaggerating for (hopefully) humorous effect, you don't want to be too careless with your personal information online because there are unethical slimeballs out there who will use that information against you in any way they can. Although, I hear that Nigerian prince is a real cool guy.

When the war of ideologies goes online, political operatives have a number of tools at their disposal, one of which is called doxing. We'll get into the definition of it here in a bit, but the reason it's become a hot topic recently is because of a Huffington Post writer named Luke O'Brien. O'Brien did a story about a Twitter user named Amy Mekelburg who has tweeted some anti-Muslim sentiments and has been retweeted by President Donald Trump. O'Brien's story exposed Mekelburg, but also opened up her family to additional harassment. And this occurred because Mekelburg left identifying information online for people to follow.

Leftists cheered this, stating racists have no right to privacy and should be exposed. Others expressed outrage at those who took it upon themselves to bring Mekelburg's private actions into the public square and expose her family to various punishments for actions they didn't directly take.

In order to understand the Leftist mindset on doxing, let's start by defining the term, shall we?

doxing

What the Left thinks it means – exposing conservatives for saying and doing things that should be called out and discouraged

What it actually means – invading someone's privacy for purely ideological reasons

One of the key elements of Leftist ideology is the ends justify the means. If they can find a way to destroy an enemy, even if it goes against their public platform, they will do it. It's just a matter of how and when. And when it comes to doxing, Leftists have no qualms doing it to conservatives because of another key element of Leftist ideology: those who do not conform are the enemy.

Nice folks, those Leftists.

In the Mekelburg situation, the Left has argued she doxed herself, which is entirely plausible and most likely happened. If O'Brien wrote a piece limited solely to her, we can debate the merits and flaws of the approach. However, that didn't happen. O'Brien went to her husband's employer for a comment, which caused her husband to get fired and a business owned by members of her family (who have openly said they don't agree with her, by the way) to get harassed. Collateral damage because Mekelburg said something the Left didn't agree with.

And while we're here, what did Mekelburg say? Among other things, she made disparaging comments about Muslim prophet Mohammed, linked to people like Sean Hannity, and told people to follow noted white supremacists. The first two are enough for Leftists to get their collectivist panties in a wad, but the third gave them all the excuse they needed to target her...and her family. Obviously, they must agree with her. After all, **they have the same last name!**

And, as with most things Leftists believe, their position is hypocritical on a number of fronts, the most glaring one being the Left's professed love of privacy. This may smack of "whataboutism", but I have to say it: the Left has more problem with a woman expressing an opposite and Constitutionally protected opinion than it has with a woman

killing an unborn baby in the womb. Call me crazy (because, trust me, plenty have), but isn't that a bit...well...stupid?

I don't condone what Mekelburg says, but she has a right to say it, thanks to the First Amendment. Which brings us to another area of Leftist hypocrisy, by the way. The Left will cry about freedom of speech being threatened whenever Donald Trump calls CNN fake news (I have another name for them that's far harsher), but they also want to limit the speech of conservatives and libertarians because they're afraid those groups will tell the truth.

And to round out this trifecta of trickery, the Left engages in guilt by association when it suits them, as it did in this case. Yet, who are the first ones to scold us for assuming terrorists are Muslims because "not all Muslims are terrorists"? Leftists, who by a complete coincidence always assume mass shooters are white men. (And, unlike them, the people who assume terrorists are Muslim tend to be right more often than wrong.)

And let me make myself perfectly clear here. Doxing done by anyone is morally wrong and, in my humble opinion, is a form of terrorism designed to control targets into either hiding or conforming to the "right" opinion. And, to take it a step further, anyone who is responsible for circulating a person's information online and/or uses it to harass innocent people is just as bad as the doxers themselves. No gray area, no letting it slide, no mulligans. If you dox or help spread the information, you are scum. Thank you for playing.

That brings us back to O'Brien. I'm sure he thought he was doing the right thing, but he should have taken more than a nanosecond to think about the implications of and fallout from taking the actions he did before submitting even a pitch to his editors. The fact it doesn't appear he took that step is a stain on his integrity and yet another blot on an already-Mount Everest-sized mountain covering the media today. As the

saying goes, two wrongs don't make a right, and O'Brien and Mekelburg are as wrong as they can be.