

Democratic Women Not Emotionally Safe

Cowdrey

Democratic women are no longer emotionally safe. In my personal experience, as a military veteran, I am often sensitive around topics of politics, yet they are brought up regardless. The overall experience is “authoritarian,” and the woman takes a “leadership role” in the conversation; however, it quickly turns into hate speech surrounding this administration.

I recognize the talking points, many of which stem from Facebook movements and propaganda, as well as biased, left-leaning news agencies. Because I was a Democrat and deeply involved in the activism arena as a vegan activist, I was able to fully immerse myself in both activist and protest culture. I left because I saw it for what it was, no one was truly going to protect me. Even though the speech was geared toward human rights and humanity, the opposite was quite true, as much of the culture involved hate, berating, and harming others, particularly when there was disagreement.

Technology aided this social decline, particularly Facebook, where algorithms rewarded hate with likes, engagement, new friends, and the ability to navigate the platform and block dissenters. However, this trend did not involve simply hate speech, it came with actual targeting, stalking, doxing, revenge pornography, and human trafficking as forms of warfare, genocide, bullying, eugenics, and even mass suicide. Anyone, from anywhere, can create an account with a fictitious name; they could be foreign adversaries posing as Americans to inflate the conflict, and often are.

Facebook profited from these algorithms. Children were trafficked more on Facebook than on any other platform. Facebook society fueled genocide in other countries, like the Rohingya genocide, where Facebook was used to spread hate speech. Facebook faced hundreds of billions in lawsuits.

World War II propagandists warned dutifully of the dangers of hate speech. Yet these warnings were lost in vain. The warnings were not heard.

We look at the case of Lindsay Clancy and how her female followers have protected the perpetrator rather than the slain children. We can also look at the case of Cornell and how male followers have chosen to protect the perpetrators rather than the victim.

These are two equal and opposite extremes, and those who suffer the most are the victims. Society chooses to fight each other, not because it's smart or because it's right, but because people choose to fight; they seek to spread the energy of violence. This is their choice, yet the energy of its evil can be felt, and it is immediate.

With half the world on the platform, Facebook, our “new hateful and violent society,” has taken form. We can give some thanks to the ACLU here, vulgar hate speech has become normalized and taken too far. It's as if hate speech itself has become the ideological god to be worshipped, protected, and guarded at all costs, even at the expense of human life.

Hate speech was not always free speech, and, in fact, there were times before the age of the ACLU when people frowned upon it. Certainly, the hate speech, language, and energy of hate today overshadow the speech of our ancestors of World War II—oh, it's far worse.

And so, this is our “reality” and our “new normal.” Yet, it doesn't have to be. We can always follow the yellow brick road that others are following. We can pick up the bricks and throw them too. Or, we can take the path of well-lit stones.

We can go our own way, and we should, because the truth of it is this, Do we really want to spend our time around people who enable evil, hate, genocide, rape, or murder? Is that really a safe person to be around? ***Not quite.***