

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

UNIFIED U.S. COMMON LAW GRAND
JURY,

Plaintiff,

v.

ALPHABET INC., YOUTUBE, GOOGLE,
FACEBOOK and TWITTER,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 20-cv-_____ (___)

NOTICE OF REMOVAL

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that defendants Alphabet Inc., Google LLC (improperly pleaded as “Google”), and YouTube LLC (improperly pleaded as “YouTube”) (collectively, the “Google Defendants”), by and through their undersigned counsel, hereby remove the civil action *Unified U.S. Common Law Grand Jury v. Alphabet Inc., YouTube, Google, Facebook, and Twitter*, Index No. 2020-507, filed on or about June 16, 2020, in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Dutchess (the “Removed Action”), to the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1441. In support of removal, the Google Defendants aver as follows:

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

1. On or about June 16, 2020, plaintiff Unified U.S. Common Law Grand Jury (“Plaintiff”), appearing *pro se*, commenced the Removed Action against the Google Defendants, Facebook, and Twitter (collectively, “Defendants”) by filing a “Verified Action at Law” in the Supreme Court of the State of New York wherein it asserts, among other things, that Defendants “conspire[d] with others to deprive the People of their unalienable right of free speech under color of custom, by force in violation of the Law of the Land. [sic] Specifically, Amendment I, 18 USC

§ 242 and 42 USC § 1985....” and demands that Defendants “cease from restricting free speech over the internet and fund a re-education program, via National Liberty Alliance for the People at a cost of four billion dollars.”

2. Plaintiff (an unincorporated association) purports to represent the interests of “more than 8600 People” in suing Defendants “on behalf of all the People.” Plaintiff alleges, *inter alia*, that politically conservative, right-wing oriented, posts on Defendants’ social media platforms and online advertisements by right-wing conservative organizations have been blocked or censored by defendants, and that such actions violate Plaintiff’s and the “People’s” First Amendment right to receive and read such content.

3. To date, no pleadings other than the “Verified Action at Law” (and the documents attached thereto, referred to as “evidence” therein) have been filed in the Removed action, and no further proceedings have been conducted in the Removed Action.

GROUND FOR REMOVAL

4. The Removed Action involves questions of federal law, namely whether Defendants’ conduct violates the First Amendment to the United States Constitution, 18 U.S.C. § 242, or 42 U.S.C. § 1985, such that original jurisdiction lies in this Court under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (which provides that “[t]he district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States.”). Additionally, the defenses available to Defendants include, but are not limited to, those under 47 U.S.C. § 230.

COMPLIANCE WITH REMOVAL PROCEDURES

5. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a), the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York is the proper place to file this Notice of Removal because it is the district

court for the federal district embracing the place where the Removed Action was filed and is pending.

6. As required by 28 U.S.C. § 1446(a), copies of all of the process, pleadings, and orders filed in the Removed Action are attached to this Notice of Removal as Exhibit A.

7. This Notice of Removal is timely under 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b) because the Google Defendants have not yet been properly served in the Removed Action. See Murphy Bros., Inc., v. Michetti Pipe Syringing, Inc., 526 U.S. 344, 347-48 (1999) (“An individual or entity named as a defendant is not obliged to engage in litigation unless notified of the action, and brought under a court’s authority, by formal process.”); Cutrone v. Mortg. Elec. Registration Sys., Inc., 749 F.3d 137, 147 (2d Cir. 2014) (noting that removal is permissible even before Section 1446(b)(1)’s 30-day removal period is triggered).¹

8. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d), promptly after the filing of this Notice of Removal in this Court, the Google Defendants will (i) give written notice thereof to Plaintiff, Facebook, and Twitter; and (ii) file a copy of this Notice of Removal with the Clerk of the Supreme Court of New York, Dutchess County, effectuating the removal. The Google Defendants will promptly file proof of the foregoing with this Court.

9. By filing this Notice of Removal, the Google Defendants do not waive any claim, argument, or defense that may be available to them, nor do the Google Defendants concede that Plaintiff has pleaded any claim upon which relief may be granted.

¹ Though Plaintiff filed an Affidavit of Service in the Removed Action, it indicates only that Plaintiff served the Summons and “Action at Law” on June 18, 2020 “by depositing a true copy in the United States Post Office thereby mailing said document[s]” to the Google Defendants. Said mailing was received by the Google Defendants on or about June 20, 2020. Though said mailing does not constitute effective service of process, this Notice of Removal is being filed within 30 days of the Google Defendants’ receipt thereof.

10. The Google Defendants reserve the right to amend or supplement this Notice as may be appropriate.

CONCLUSION

11. For the foregoing reasons, the Removed Action is hereby removed to the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York. The Google Defendants respectfully request that the Court enter such orders and grant such other and further relief as may be necessary to effectuate the removal.

Dated: New York, New York
July 20, 2020

HERRICK, FEINSTEIN LLP

By: /s/ Barry Werbin
Barry Werbin
Michelle M. Sekowski

Two Park Avenue
New York, New York 10016
Tel: (212) 592-1400
bwerbin@herrick.com
msekowski@herrick.com

*Attorneys for Defendants Alphabet, Inc.,
Google LLC, and YouTube LLC*

Exhibit A

COUNTY CLERK, DUTCHESS COUNTY

Application for INDEX NUMBER pursuant to C.P.L.R. Section 8018.

INDEX NUMBER
2020 - 507
Do not write in this space.

FEE - \$210

Spaces below to be TYPED or PRINTED by applicant

TITLE OF ACTION OR PROCEEDING

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF DUTCHESS

UNIFIED U.S. COMMON LAW GRAND JURY

CHECK AS APPLICABLE

-Against-

CONSUMER CREDIT TRANSACTION

NOT CONSUMER CREDIT TRANSACTION

NON PAYMENT OF CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATION

Alphabet Inc., Youtube, Google, Facebook and Twitter;

Name and address of Attorney for Plaintiff or Petitioner	UNIFIED U.S. COMMON LAW GRAND JURY, In Pro Per 3979 Albany Post Road, Hyde Park, NY 12538 Phone - (845) 229-0250; Fax - (888) 891-8977	2020 JUN 14 PM 1:01 DUTCHESS COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE RECEIVED
Telephone No.:		
Name and address of Attorney for Defendant or Respondent	Alphabet Inc 1600 Amphitheatre Pkwy, Mountain View, CA 94043	
Telephone No.:		

A. Nature and object of action TORT
or
Nature of special proceeding Common Law

IS THIS ACTION OR PROCEEDING CONFIDENTIAL UNDER ANY LAW OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK?

YES

NO

ORIGINATING PAPERS SUBMITTED (Please check below)

- Summons & Complaint
- Summons w/Notice
- Notice of Petition
- Petition

- Order to Show Cause
- Poor Person Aff./Atty's Cert.
- Other _____


B. Application for Index Number filed by:

Plaintiff

Defendant

June 15, 2020

DATE


SIGNATURE (type name below)
John Vidurek

**NEW YORK STATE SUPREME COURT
DUTCHESS COUNTY**

• 10 Market Street Poughkeepsie, NY 12601 •

UNIFIED US COMMON LAW GRAND JURY on behalf
of the People;

Plaintiff

- against -

Alphabet Inc., Youtube, Google, Facebook and
Twitter;

Defendants

JURISDICTION: Court of Record
Index No. ~~2020 507~~

TRIBUNAL: Jury

SUMMONS

YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED to appear and answer this endorsed summons in the New York Supreme Court, County of Dutchess, Court of Record; located at 10 Market Street, Poughkeepsie, New York 12601;

You must answer within 30 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached action. Motions in order to avoid an answer are not permitted under common law.

Upon your failure to appear and answer, judgment will be taken against you for the relief demanded in the complaint, together with the cost of this action.

You also must file your answer with the above said court.

SEAL Dutchess County New York

June 15, 2020


John Vidurek, Grand Jury Foreman

DUTCHESS COUNTY
CLERK'S OFFICE
RECEIVED
2020 JUN 16 PM 1:02

Complaint

NEW YORK STATE SUPREME COURT

DUTCHESS COUNTY

10 Market Street, Poughkeepsie NY 12601

ACTION AT LAW¹

INDEX No. **2020** -507

PLAINTIFFS: Unified United States Common Law Grand Jury

-against-

DEFENDANTS: Alphabet Inc.
Google, LLC, d/b/a YouTube
Google, LLC
Facebook, Inc.
Twitter, Inc.

2020 JUN 12 PM 1:02
DUTCHESS COUNTY
CLERK'S OFFICE
RECEIVED

COPIED: President Donald J. Trump, the White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW; Washington, DC 20500

Attorney General William Barr, U.S. Dept. of Justice;
950 Pennsylvania Ave, NW; Washington, DC 20530

¹ AT LAW: Blacks 4th This phrase is used to point out that a thing is to be done according to the course of the common law; it is distinguished from a proceeding in equity.

CONTACT INFORMATION

PLAINTIFFS' MAILING ADDRESS:

UUSCLGJ c/o NLA, Suite 107
3979 Albany Post Road
Hyde Park, NY 12538
Fax (888) 891-8977

DEFENDANTS' MAILING ADDRESSES:

Alphabet Inc.
1600 Amphitheatre Pkwy,
Mountain View, CA 94043

Youtube
Google LLC, D/B/A YouTube
901 Cherry Ave.
San Bruno, CA 94066

Google
1600 Amphitheatre Pkway
Mountain View, CA 94043

Facebook
1 Hacker Way
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Twitter, Inc.
1355 Market Street Suite 900
San Francisco, CA 94103

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summons -----	
Cover -----	page i
Contact Information -----	page ii
Table of Contents -----	page iii-v
Verified Action at Law -----	page 1
I: Jurisdiction & Rules -----	page 3
II: Authority -----	page 3
III: Big Tech Public Social Network Services -----	page 4
IV: Background -----	page 5
V: The Internet is A Public Space/Forum -----	page 5
VI: Cyber Thought Police -----	page 6
VII: Evidence -----	page 7
Facebook -----	page 8
Youtube -----	page 9
Google -----	page 15
Twitter -----	page 16
Conclusion -----	page 17
Wherefore clause -----	page 19

Evidence Attached:

- Media Monopoly
- Top 10 most outrageous censorship stories of 2019 12/26/2019, By JD Heyes
- Facebook's Community Standards, Facebook

- Facebook censorship: Alex Hern, The Guardian
- Facebook doesn't believe in free speech: By L. Brent Bozell III, Fox News
- Censorship by YouTube Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia
- Rand Paul Blasts YouTube over Censorship of Speech on Senate Floor, Feb 13, 2020
- Shameless Censorship by the BBC and YouTube: Gumshoe News, April 10, 2020, by Dee
- YouTube CEO: "Anything that goes against the WHO is a violation of YouTube policies," By Tom Parker
- The New York Times, YouTube to Remove Thousands of Videos Pushing Extreme Views: Content "alleging that a group is superior in order to justify discrimination, segregation or exclusion" and videos denying that violent incidents occurred will be removed, YouTube said Wednesday Credit... Dado Ruvic/Reuters. By Kevin Roose and Kate Conger, June 5, 2019
- Anyone who contradicts the corrupt, communist-run WHO is now in automatic violation of YouTube's policies 04/09/2020 / By Ethan Huff
- Columnist slams YouTube's censorship by World Tribune on May 4, 2020
- Deleted former KGB agent video: YouTube deleted a wildly popular video featuring a Carlson Blasts YouTube Over Censorship Carlson Tucker from Fox news
- Anyone who contradicts the corrupt, communist-run WHO is now in automatic violation of YouTube's policies, 04/09/2020 / By Ethan Huff
- YouTube is now banning "wrongthink" by labeling it "hate"... but it's really just a way to silence anyone who disagrees with the twisted agendas of the radical Left 12/17/2019 / By Ethan Huff
- Censorship by Google Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia
- In today's twisted world, threatening to kill ICE agents is ruled "protected speech" while questioning vaccine safety gets you banned and attacked: By Ethan Huff, 12/26/2019
- Why is Twitter Censoring Free Speech? February 10, 2017 By Aaron, There has been a disturbing trend of increasing censorship against free speech on Twitter. This comes not from radicals or extremists on the platform but from Twitter itself. Needless to say the increased Twitter censorship is unsettling.

- David Icke is horribly wrong about the coronavirus, but I support his right to speak
- Here are the top 10 most outrageous censorship stories of 2019, 12/26/2019 / By JD Heyes
- President Donald J. Trump signed an Executive Order Preventing Online Censorship

Statutes, Codes, Rules, Supreme Court Rulings & Common Law Documents

- Title 18 USC §242
- Title 42 USC §1985
- Title 28 USC §132
- Title 47 USC 230
- Title 28 USC §2072
- Federal rule 2
- Federal rule 12
- Rules Enabling Act
- New York Constitution Article 6b
- Magna Carta
- Declaration of Independence
- Bill of Rights Amendment I
- Bill of Rights Amendment XIV
- Executive Order Preventing Online Censorship, President Trump 5-28-20
- United States v. Calandra, 414 U.S. 338, 343 (1974)
- Costello v. United States, 350 U.S. 359, 361-362 (1956)
- Branzburg v. Hayes, 408 U.S. 665, 686-687 (1972).”
- Hague v CIO (1939)
- Packingham v. North Carolina, 137 S. Ct. 1730, 1737 (2017).”

**NEW YORK STATE SUPREME COURT
DUTCHESS COUNTY**

• 10 Market Street Poughkeepsie, NY 12601 •

UNIFIED U.S. COMMON LAW GRAND JURY on behalf of the
People;

Plaintiff

- against -

Alphabet Inc., Youtube, Google, Facebook and Twitter;

Defendants

JURISDICTION: Court of Record

Index No. _____

TRIBUNAL: Jury

VERIFIED ACTION AT LAW¹

Copied: President Trump, AG William Barr

NEW YORK STATE)
):SS
DUTCHESS COUNTY)

We the People have been providentially entrusted to dispense justice via Natural Law; and were provided legal recourse to address the conduct of those who, having a fiduciary duty will abridge the Peoples' unalienable right of free speech, secured by Amendment I. The People have the unbridled right by law and in law to empanel their own grand juries which can present true bills and in this extraordinary case to prosecute for damages on behalf of the People in a court of law in order to protect the unalienable rights of the People.

"If any of our civil servants shall have transgressed against any of the people in any respect; and, they shall ask us (Common Law Grand Jury) to cause that error to be amended without delay; or, shall have broken some one of the articles of peace or security; and, their transgression shall have been shown to four Jurors of the twenty five; and, if those four Jurors are unable to settle the transgression, they shall come to the twenty-five, showing to the Grand Jury the error which shall be enforced by the law of the land." – Magna Carta, paragraph 61

Therefore, the Unified United States Common Law Grand Jury, a/k/a "Sureties of the Peace," hereinafter, We the People, sue Alphabet Inc., Youtube, Google, Facebook and Twitter, hereinafter defendants and co-conspirators with the mockingbird media and federal judiciary to

¹ **AT LAW:** [Bouvier's] This phrase is used to point out that a thing is to be done according to the course of the common law; it is distinguished from a proceeding in equity.

destroy our Republic, for four billion dollars, collectively.² Whereas, funds will be used to properly educate the People in the science of "Government by Consent;" and to return a classical education to our elementary and secondary schools."

The United States of America is in danger of being destroyed by the Deep State,³ New World Order's Federal Judiciary, it's "Mockingbird Media," Media Monopoly [*Attached*] and it's "Big Tech Giants."⁴ All these work in harmony to deny a Republican form of government by burying the truth, and replacing self-evident truth with socialism via "political correctness." The damage done to the People will take a generation to repair, via a proper and classical education where People are taught their heritage and how to think, not what to think!

The defendants are self-appointed authoritarians that claim to acknowledge and recognize the importance of People to feel empowered and to have the liberty to freely express themselves thereby, bearing witness against themselves as wrongdoers as they conspire with others to deprive the People of their unalienable right of free speech under color of custom, by force in violation of the Law of the Land. Specifically, Amendment I, 18 USC §242, and 42 USC §1985:

Amendment I: "*Congress shall make no law ...abridging the freedom of speech...*"

18 U.S. Code § 242: "*Whoever,⁵ under color of any ...custom,⁶ willfully subjects any person in any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution ..., shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; ..."*

42 USC 1985(3): "*Depriving persons of rights or privileges: If two or more persons in any State or Territory conspire or go in disguise [as an authority] on the [cyber] highway⁷ or on the premises of another, for the purpose of depriving, either directly or*

² 1 billion/\$327 million People = \$3.05 x 4 = \$12.20 per person.

³ **Trump:** "*I Have A Chance To Break The Deep State, They Tried To Take Down A Duly Elected President.*" Posted By Tim Hains, May 25, 2020.

⁴ Alphabet Inc., Youtube, Google, Facebook and Twitter.

⁵ **WHOEVER:** This word in statutes may be construed as including corporations and partnerships. *American Socialist Soc. v. U. S., C.C.A.N.Y., 266 F. 212, 213; U. S. v. American Socialist Soc., D.C. N.Y., 260 F. 885, 887.*

⁶ **CUSTOM:** A "custom" is a practice or course of acting. *Goslin v. Kurn, 351 Mo. 395, 173 S.W.2d 79, 86.* Ordinary or usual way of doing a thing, habit ; practice. *Adelman v. Altman, 209 Mo.App. 583, 240 S.W. 272, 276; Kent v. Town of Patterson, 141 N.Y.S. 932, 933, 80 Misc. Rep. 560 ; Maeder Steel Products Co. v. Zanello, 109 Or. 562, 220 P. 155, 161; Carter v. Sioux City Service Co., 160 Iowa 78, 141 N.W. 26, 29.* A usage or practice of the people, which, by common adoption and acquiescence, and by long and unvarying habit, has become compulsory, and has acquired the force of a law with respect to the place or subject-matter to which it relates. *Adams v. Insurance Co., 95 Pa. 355, 40 Am.Rep. 662; King v. Shelton, Tex.Civ. App., 252 S.W. 194, 195; Conahan v. Fisher, 233 Mass. 234, 124 N.E. 13, 15; Lawrence v. Portland Ry., Light & Power Co., 91 Or. 559, 179 P. 485, 486; U. S. Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation v. Levensaler, 53 App.D.C. 322, 290 F. 297, 300.*

⁷ **HIGHWAY:** An easement acquired by the public in the use of a road or way for thoroughfare. *Bolender v. Southern Michigan Telephone Co., 182 Mich. 646, 148 N.W. 697, 700.* A free and public roadway, or street; one which every person has the right to use. *Abbott v. Duluth, C.C.Minn., 104 F. 837.* *Illinois Cent. R. Co. v. Bennett, C.C.A.Miss., 296 F. 436, 437.* Its prime essentials are the right of common enjoyment on the one hand and the duty of public maintenance on the other. *Hildebrand v. Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co., 219 N.C. 402, 14 S.E.2d 252, 254, 255.*

indirectly, any person or class of persons of the equal protection of the laws, or of equal privileges and immunities under the laws; ...If one or more persons engaged therein do, or cause to be done, any act in furtherance of the object of such conspiracy, whereby another is injured in his person or property, or deprived of having and exercising any right or privilege of a citizen of the United States, the party so injured or deprived may have an action for the recovery of damages occasioned by such injury or deprivation, against any one or more of the conspirators."

I: JURISDICTION & RULES

Every State⁸ and Federal⁹ court shall be a court of record. A court of record¹⁰ is a judicial tribunal having attributes and exercising functions independently of the person of the magistrate designated generally to hold it and proceeds according to the course of common (natural) law."

This is a Natural Law Proceeding under the rules of common law and not a civil law proceeding. Unlike Common Law rules, civil law rules are not law; rules are nothing more than prescribed conduct in a particular area. Furthermore, Congress wrote legislation under §2072(b) rendering federal rule 2 is of no force or effect and thereby null and void. And federal rule 12 is without force in Common Law.

§2072(b) such rules shall not abridge, enlarge or modify any substantive right. All laws in conflict with such rules shall be of no further force or effect after such rules have taken effect.

The Rules Enabling Act and all construction of law upon it is TREASON, governments are instituted among Men, by the People, to secure rights. Whereas, neither congress nor the judiciary has the power or authority to abrogate the unalienable right of Natural Law, this would be Absolute Despotism!

II: AUTHORITY

This is a Natural Law court of record and not a civil law court. Therefore, the rules of civil procedure do not apply. This court of record was opened by the Common Law Grand Jury on behalf of the People. Whereas, the first recorded Grand Jury made-up of twenty-five jurist in 1215AD, via the Magna Carta, was served upon a tyrant king on behalf of a free and independent People forcing the king to obey the Law of the Land. And again in 1776AD, via the Declaration of Independence fifty-six men found it necessary to separated themselves from a tyrant king to restore the Law of the Land, where we read:

⁸ **NY Constitution Article 6b:** The court of appeals, the supreme court including the appellate divisions thereof, the court of claims, the county court, the surrogate's court, the family court, the courts or court of civil and criminal jurisdiction of the city of New York, and such other courts as the legislature may determine shall be courts of record.

⁹ **USC Title 28 §132:** Creation and composition of district courts: (a) There shall be in each judicial district a district court which shall be a court of record known as the United States District Court for the district.

¹⁰ **"A Court of Record** is a judicial tribunal having attributes and exercising functions independently of the person of the magistrate designated generally to hold it, and proceeding according to the course of common law, its acts and proceedings being enrolled for a perpetual memorial." Jones v. Jones, 188 Mo.App. 220, 175 S.W. 227, 229.

“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.—That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.”

Justice Powell, in *United States v. Calandra*, 414 U.S. 338, 343 (1974), stated, *“The institution of the grand jury is deeply rooted in Anglo-American history; [n3] In England, the grand jury [p343] served for centuries, both as a body of accusers, sworn to discover, and present for trial, persons suspected of criminal wrongdoing; and, as a protector of citizens against arbitrary and oppressive governmental action. In this country, the Founders thought the grand jury so essential to basic liberties, that they provided, in the Fifth Amendment, that federal prosecution for serious crimes can only be instituted by a ‘presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury.’”* Cf. *Costello v. United States*, 350 U.S. 359, 361-362 (1956). *The grand jury’s historic functions survive to this day. Its responsibilities determination whether there is probable cause to believe a crime has been committed, and the protection of citizens against unfounded criminal prosecutions. Branzburg v. Hayes*, 408 U.S. 665, 686-687 (1972).”

III: BIG TECH PUBLIC SOCIAL NETWORK SERVICES

Alphabet Inc., Google, Youtube, Facebook, and Twitter, hereinafter defendants, in today’s cyber age provide a traditional public social networking service for social media where everyone has equal access to express their opinions as long as it does not violate law.

Google has almost become a synonym for the internet, handling more than 40,000 queries per second. That translates to over 3.5 billion searches every day! Everyone who uses a computer, smart phone or tablet uses Google in some way or another. As of December 2019, Google holds 92.71% of the search engine market share! You can get up to 30% more customers only by moving up one spot in Google’s search results. Users are 4 times more likely to click on a Google ad than on one by any of its competitors. Google’s search volume grows by about 15% per year. These statements are no exaggeration, considering Google has over a billion people using each of its products and services. If you want to look at the exact Google statistics about these products and services in recent times, www.techjury.net/ has prepared a list. Twitter boasts two billion active devices,¹¹ YouTube more than 2 billion monthly users,¹² and Facebook’s more than 2.6 billion monthly active users.¹³

Like streets, walks, parks, malls, and other public places, the communal internet via public cyber venues have become traditional public forums such as Google, Youtube, Facebook, and Twitter are used for purposes of assembly, communicating thoughts between citizens, and discussing public issues and thereby are also held in trust for the use of the public.

¹¹ Source: <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Twitter>

¹² Source: <https://www.omnicoreagency.com/youtube-statistics/>

¹³ Source: <https://www.statista.com/statistics/264810/number-of-monthly-active-facebook-users-worldwide/>

IV: BACKGROUND

The Internet is an immense global network, paid for by the People, which reach millions of homes and businesses. It began as a relatively simple computer network called ARPANET, funded by a Department of Defense research agency. ARPANET linked educational institutions and research facilities. Users could transfer files, send e-mail, and post messages in a forum called USENET. Later, the development of HTTP (hypertext transfer protocol) allowed users to make connections from one electronic document to others by using hyperlinks. Such hyperlinked electronic documents (*called webpages*) can consist of text, pictures, and sound files. Over a billion of these webpages form the World Wide Web. The transmission of webpages, e-mails, files, and similar electronic data takes place on the massive network known as the Internet. What began as a simple way for military and educational researchers to communicate has developed into an international means for People to communicate ideas, as well as transmitting text, pictures, video, and sound files.

The main difference between public and private networks, apart from the fact that access to a private network is tightly controlled and access to a public network is not, is that the addressing of policies on a public network must be considered carefully, whereas addressing on a private network has a little more latitude.

The public Internet, paid for by the People, implies that everyone has access.¹⁴ It is a public domain¹⁵ where People have the unalienable right to freedom of opinion and expression. The Internet, as an abstract thing, tends to be treated as a public space by law and thereby regulated, though subject to the fact that the nature of digital communication (copying) makes copyright law more relevant to everyday life than most people expect. That's the Internet "out there." If you run a website that doesn't otherwise run counter to any law, you can say whatever you like on it.

V: THE INTERNET IS A PUBLIC SPACE/FORUM

Alphabet Inc., Youtube, Google, Facebook and Twitter provide a service and thereby have a fiduciary duty on behalf of the beneficiaries of that space, being We the People. The United States Supreme Court has defined the traditional public forum, and how it has applied the First Amendment to regulations restricting speech in the traditional public forum. The case, *Hague v CIO* (1939) considers an ordinance which gave a city official the discretion to decide whether an organization seeking to hold a meeting in public spaces in the city would be allowed to do so. Whenever the official concluded that the meeting posed a risk of disturbances, he could reject the request. The Court ruled the law void on its face. The Court said;

¹⁴ Public Internet: The Internet (upper case "I"). Contrast with "intranet" (lower case "i"), which is an internal, private network. The public Internet implies that **everyone has access**; however, user registration is required for an email account, and many Web-based services also require registration.

¹⁵ Public domain: (1) The state of belonging or being available to the public as a whole, and therefore not subject to copyright. (2) Land owned directly by the government. (3) The realm embracing property rights that belong to the community at large, are unprotected by copyright or patent, and are subject to appropriation by anyone.

“Streets and parks...have immemorially been held in trust for the use of the public and time out of mind, have been used for purposes of assembly, communicating thoughts between citizens, and discussing public issues. Such use has, from ancient times, been part of the privileges, immunities, and liberties of citizens.”

Some justices concluded that the law violated the Fourteenth Amendment’s privileges and immunities clause, while Justice Stone argued that law violated the First Amendment, as incorporated. In another set of cases decided that same year, the Court struck down ordinances banning leafletting justified as a means of preventing littering on city streets and sidewalks (*Schneider v State*). The Court indicated in *Schneider* that:

“When it comes to restrictions on speech in a traditional public forum, it will not be enough for the government to show that its ban is content-neutral.”

VI: CYBER THOUGHT POLICE

As a general rule, the internet is a public space in the same sense as the sidewalks or the hallways at the mall. Peoples’ unalienable rights, protected by the Bill of Rights, are strongest in what are known as “traditional public forums,” such as streets, sidewalks, and parks. You also have the unalienable right, protected by the Bill of Rights, to speak out on other public property, like plazas and in front of government buildings, as long as you are not blocking access to the government building or interfering with other purposes the property was designed for. Unalienable Rights by their nature cannot be taken away; they are gifted by nature’s God. Every human has Unalienable Rights regardless of the situation or circumstances surrounding them. Rights can be infringed or denied, but this does not mean they cease to exist. It means only that whoever infringed those rights has committed a crime against the victim.

In the novel “Nineteen Eighty-four” by George Orwell, the fictional character “Big Brother,” the dictator of the totalitarian empire of Oceania (corporatism), used hidden devices in every room that enabled his thought Police to monitor the activities of all citizens. Today the “Big Brother Problem” is a timely, difficult and sweeping topic, covering digital surveillance by government, public, and private actors using computers, phones, and even televisions that have cameras and possibly listening devices and its implications for rights are alarming! Like Oceania’s constant, vicious wars, its propagandistic language (Newspeak), and its Anti-Sex League¹⁶ are the most blatant manifestations of his control. His public personality is a mixture of benevolence, charisma, brutal militarism, and insinuation. Orwell’s satiric portrait of Big Brother anticipated with alarming accuracy the characteristics of a number of real-life 20th-century despots.

The term Big Brother has come to signify the “Deep State Shadow Government” and their corporate partners like Google, Youtube, Facebook, and Tweeter intruding into individual lives and controlling their very thoughts and ideas. The defendants sustain the mockingbird media’s socialist narrative that is destructive to the wellbeing of our American Heritage. Through censorship and manipulation of search results they diabolically bury or remove news and opinions that are contrary to their socialist agenda, a violation of anti-trust laws.

¹⁶ Party intends to abolish the institution of the family, so all children will be the products of artificial insemination and grow up in public institutions.

People can set their own social parameters, Youtube Facebook and Twitter provide for the ability of the People themselves to delete posts to their Youtube and Facebook and ban people from contacting them if they are obnoxious. And why is Google burying certain types of information? A free and independent People do not need an abusive big brother.

VII: EVIDENCE

Larry Page wrote,¹⁷ *“As Sergey and I wrote in the original founders’ letter 11 years ago, “Google, having over a billion users, is not a conventional¹⁸ company. We do not intend to become one.”* Conventional meaning that they do not intend to follow accepted customs and proprieties or conforming with accepted standards.

YouTube’s mission statement contradicts their actions, *“YouTube’s mission is to give everyone a voice and show them the world.¹⁹ We believe that everyone deserves to have a voice, and that the world is a better place when we listen, share and build community through our stories. Our values are based on four essential freedoms that define who we are.”*

- 1) Freedom of Expression - We believe people should be able to speak freely, share opinions, foster open dialogue, and that creative freedom leads to new voices, formats and possibilities.
- 2) Freedom of Information - We believe everyone should have easy, open access to information and that video is a powerful force for education, building understanding, and documenting world events, big and small.
- 3) Freedom of Opportunity - We believe everyone should have a chance to be discovered, build a business and succeed on their own terms, and that people—not gatekeepers—decide what’s popular.
- 4) Freedom to Belong - We believe everyone should be able to find communities of support, break down barriers, transcend borders and come together around shared interests and passions.

The following is a synopsis of the attached news reports representing just a fraction of millions of censoring and manipulations perpetrated by Youtube, Facebook, Google, and Twitter every month in order to expand a treasonous Marxist and anti-Constitutional narrative.

(Attached) Top 10 most outrageous censorship stories of 2019 12/26/2019, By JD Heyes

- 1) Google to begin blocking all anti-cancer, ‘anti-vax,’ and anti-GMO websites.
- 2) Google declares supplements and organics to be a ‘lie’ and a ‘scam.’
- 3) Facebook also pledged to block ALL posts questioning the deadly vaccine industry.
- 4) Twitter blocked Natural News and the Health Ranger.
- 5) Facebook banned Natural News.

¹⁷ <https://abc.xyz/>

¹⁸ Conventional: Following accepted customs and proprieties.

¹⁹ <https://www.youtube.com/about/>

FACEBOOK

(Attached) Facebook's Community Standards, Facebook

- 1) Removes content that has the potential to contribute to real-world harm,
- 2) Prohibits the coordination of harm, sale of medical masks and related goods,
- 3) Prohibits hate speech,
- 4) Prohibits bullying and harassment and misinformation that contributes to the risk of imminent violence or physical harm,
- 5) Keeps the members safe during this crisis,
- 6) Refers to the participants as their community,
- 7) Limits expression,
- 8) Claims their commitment to judge is paramount over the Peoples right of free speech,
- 9) Claims to be the authenticators of the contents posted by the 2.41 billion monthly active users!
- 10) Police peoples' communications and judge if People are misrepresenting themselves
- 11) Authenticates what is newsworthy,
- 12) Authenticates what is in the public interest,
- 13) They weigh the public interest value against the risk of harm,
- 14) They decide what rights humans may have,
- 15) They decide what has the potential to intimidate, exclude or silence others, and then silences the alleged intimidators.

(Attached) Facebook censorship: Alex Hern, The Guardian

- 1) Facebook is censoring the internet every day, warping your understanding of the world around you to benefit its corporate interests, and fundamentally changing the media landscape in a potentially apocalyptic fashion.
- 2) Facebook has an entire team of writers working on these statements, according to a report from Gizmodo, and those writers are apparently encouraged to focus on mainstream news sites such as the BBC and CNN over fringe right-wing outlets like Breitbart or Newsmax.
- 3) Facebook users don't even realize that the news feed is edited at all. A 2015 study suggested that more than 60% of Facebook users are entirely unaware of any algorithmic curation on Facebook at all: "They believed every single story from their friends and followed pages appeared in their news feed",

(Attached) Facebook doesn't believe in free speech: By L. Brent Bozell III | Fox News

- 1) Facebook is now openly antagonistic toward the right. Posts aren't just blocked by humans who decide what they do or don't like; they are blocked by computer programs designed by humans to ensure liberal sensibilities are not offended.
- 2) The New York Times described a global network with more than 15,000 employees assessing content based on rulebooks more than 1,400 pages long. The rules secretly designate groups as hate organizations and are so specific they even ban certain emoji use. Hate speech mandates alone run "200 jargon-filled, head-spinning pages," wrote The Times.

- 3) The result is chaos. There's no consistency in what Facebook bans or doesn't ban — except that conservatives suffer. Pro-life, pro-gun and pro-Trump content all run afoul of Facebook's eager hate speech censors. Just days before the annual March for Life, Facebook blocked advertising for the new pro-life movie "Roe v. Wade."
- 4) Around the Fourth of July, Facebook censored a post for "hate speech." It was the text of the Declaration of Independence.
- 5) Conservatives like Samaritan's Purse head Franklin Graham have been targeted, as well. Graham was suspended recently for a comment he made two years ago. Facebook later apologized. This is commonplace occurrence for conservatives. The company bans, blocks or suspends and then later apologizes ... sometimes.
- 6) The radical left has no such worries. Smash Racism DC, the Antifa group that targeted Fox host Tucker Carlson's home and threatened his wife, is still on the site. So is Splinternews, which posted the personal cell phone number of Trump senior adviser Stephen Miller. Even reprehensible anti-Semite Louis Farrakhan has a Facebook page with more than 1.1 million followers.
- 7) Zuckerberg was asked, "What should be the limits to what people can express?" Then he said the site was instituting more content controls that would limit what you see "even if it doesn't actually violate our standards." That's called shadow banning content. Facebook claims InfoWars is fake news and if so what about CNN, MSNBC, ABC and others?
- 8) Chief Operating Officer Sheryl Sandberg has publicly committed to supporting radical left-wing groups — against conservatives.
- 9) Facebook told reporters on July 11 that instead of completely banning pages behind hoaxes and misinformation, it would rather demote their posts so fewer people see them.

YOUTUBE

(Attached) Censorship by YouTube Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia:

- 1) In March 2018, The Atlantic found that YouTube had de-listed a video where journalist Daniel Lombroso reported a speech by white nationalist Richard B. Spencer at the 2016 annual conference of the National Policy Institute, where they celebrated Donald Trump's win at the presidential election.[136] YouTube re-listed the video after The Atlantic sent a complaint.
- 2) In June 2019, YouTube updated its hate speech policy to prohibit hateful and supremacist work, to limit the spread of violent extremist content online. This includes content that justify discrimination, segregation or exclusion based on qualities like age, gender, race, caste, religion, sexual orientation or veteran status. For example, videos that include Nazi ideology, Holocaust denial, Sandy Hook conspiracy theories, or flat Earth theories. The policy also aims to reduce borderline content and harmful misinformation, such as videos promoting phony miracle cures for serious illnesses.
- 3) In February 2020, YouTube reportedly began censoring any content related to the novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) by removal or demonetization citing "sensitive topics" advertiser-friendly content guideline on Twitter.

(Attached) Rand Paul Blasts YouTube over Censorship of Speech on Senate Floor, Feb 13, 2020

- 1) Senator Rand Paul (R-KY) has called out Google-owned YouTube after it blacklisted a clip of him speaking on the Senate floor, an act of censorship he calls “chilling and disturbing.” Google censored Paul because he read out the name of the alleged “whistleblower,” Eric Ciaramella.
- 2) Paul said, It is a chilling and disturbing day in America when giant web companies such as YouTube decide to censure speech. Now, even protected speech, such as that of a senator on the Senate floor, can be blocked from getting to the American people. This is dangerous and politically biased. Nowhere in my speech did I accuse anyone of being a whistleblower, nor do I know the whistleblower’s identity.
- 3) A spokeswoman for YouTube, Ivy Choi, defended the company’s censorship of Sen. Paul in a comment, describing Ciaramella as the whistleblower: Videos, comments, and other forms of content that mention the leaked whistleblower’s name violate YouTube’s Community Guidelines and will be removed from YouTube. We’ve removed hundreds of videos and over ten thousand comments that contained the name. Video uploaders have the option to edit their videos to exclude the name and re-upload.
- 4) Paul said, Manager Schiff and Counsel for the President, are you aware that house intelligence committee staffer Shawn Misko had a close relationship with Eric Ciaramella when at the National Security council together, and are you aware and how do you respond to reports that Ciaramella and Misko may have worked together to plot impeaching the President before there were formal House proceedings? Explaining his argument further in a subsequent CNN segment, Sen. Paul said, “I think it’s very important that we know if there was a concerted government plot to bring the president down by a lot of employees.”

(Attached) Shameless Censorship by the BBC and YouTube: Gumshoe News, April 10, 2020, by Dee McLachlan – How Dare They LOCKDOWN Our Minds. Two days ago I was trawling through interesting videos. I saved the links to about nine Youtube clips. When I returned to the list about 24 hours later, at least four had done a “disappearing act”. One had been placed on “private”, the others had a “violating policy” message. Gone with the Wind.

- 1) After Infowars was removed from various platforms, a number of other alternative sites were targeted. They were wiping mostly conservative voices off platforms, and expunging their audiences.
- 2) This week a new censorship war has begun — the eradication of ideas. This is equivalent of book burning through the ages — when past authorities suppressed dissenting views or beliefs that posed a threat to the prevailing order. Man has consistently set fire to ideas. There was the burying of scholars in China (210–213 BCE); the Roman emperor Constantine burning books; and in AD 367 Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, destroyed ‘unacceptable’ writings. During the conquest of the Americas, records of knowledge of the Aztecs was destroyed — but the Aztecs had previously destroyed Mayan books and documents. It’s the thing to do, and it’s back in fashion. Book burning in Berlin, May 1933 - Welcome to 2020. It’s no longer book-burning, it’s now “knowledge-erase”. No fire or heat required — just a docile locked down public, and a neat algorithm. For it seems many have had their brains in “lockdown” for some time now.
- 3) “YouTube has banned all conspiracy theory videos falsely linking coronavirus symptoms to 5G networks. The Google-owned service will now delete videos violating the policy. It [YouTube] had previously limited itself to reducing the frequency it recommended them in its Up Next section.

- 4) “The move follows a live-streamed interview with conspiracy theorist David Icke on Monday, in which he had linked the technology to the pandemic. YouTube said the video would be wiped. During the interview, Mr Icke falsely claimed there “is a link between 5G and this health crisis”.
- 5) “We have clear policies that prohibit videos promoting medically unsubstantiated methods to prevent the coronavirus in place of seeking medical treatment [Hang on, much of the advice being deleted is by medical professionals], and we quickly remove videos violating these policies when flagged to us,” a spokeswoman for YouTube told the BBC. “Now any content that disputes the existence or transmission of Covid-19, as described by the WHO [World Health Organization] and local health authorities is in violation of YouTube policies. “This includes conspiracy theories which claim that the symptoms are caused by 5G.” But the BBC claims that conspiracy theories claiming “5G... helps transmit coronavirus” have been condemned by the scientific community, saying it’s “complete rubbish”. That makes sense. 5G could not “transmit” the virus — but might it affect a person’s immune system?

(Attached) YouTube CEO: “Anything that goes against the WHO is a violation of YouTube policies,”
By Tom Parker:

- 1) YouTube CEO Susan Wojcicki discussed how the platform has responded to the pandemic by removing thousands of videos and sending over 10 billion views to legacy media outlets.
- 2) Wojcicki gave examples of content that would be a violation of YouTube’s policies, including anything “that is medically unsubstantiated, so people saying like, take vitamin C, take turmeric, like those are/or will cure you. Those are the examples of things that would be a violation of our policy.”
- 3) Wojcicki said that “anything that would go against World Health Organization [WHO] recommendations would be a violation of our policy” – the same WHO that amplified China’s propaganda about there being “no evidence of human-to-human transmission” of the coronavirus and criticized Taiwan after a Chinese propaganda campaign on Twitter.
- 4) Wojcicki has chosen “authoritative sources” (legacy media outlets) and public health organizations – many of which were downplaying the severity of the coronavirus and telling the public masks are not effective as recently as late March, only to change their rhetoric in April to position the coronavirus as a much more serious threat and recommend wearing masks.
- 5) YouTube CEO Susan Wojcicki told CNN’s Brian Stelter “anything that would go against World Health Organization recommendations” is a violation of YouTube’s policies (CNN – Reliable Sources)
- 6) The YouTube CEO framed these changes as “progress” and said they’ve created an environment where “if you talk to most people,” it’s “really hard, if not impossible” to find misinformation.
- 7) During the second half of the interview, Wojcicki praised YouTube’s use of machines to review and take down content and claimed that “they have been able to continue to be really effective during this time” – a reversal of the platform’s previous sentiment that relying on automated systems during the pandemic will result in more deleted videos, including those that don’t violate community guidelines.

(Attached) The New York Times, YouTube to Remove Thousands of Videos Pushing Extreme Views: Content "alleging that a group is superior in order to justify discrimination, segregation or exclusion" and videos denying that violent incidents occurred will be removed, YouTube said Wednesday Credit... Dado Ruvic/Reuters. By Kevin Roose and Kate Conger, June 5, 2019

- 1) YouTube announced plans on Wednesday to remove thousands of videos and channels that advocate neo-Nazism, white supremacy and other bigoted ideologies in an attempt to clean up extremism and hate speech on its popular service.
- 2) The new policy will ban "videos alleging that a group is superior in order to justify discrimination, segregation or exclusion," the company said in a blog post. The prohibition will also cover videos denying that violent events, like the mass shooting at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Connecticut, took place.
- 3) YouTube did not name any specific channels or videos that would be banned. But on Wednesday, numerous far-right creators began complaining that their videos had been deleted, or had been stripped of ads, presumably a result of the new policy.
- 4) Youtube said: "It's our responsibility to protect that, and prevent our platform from being used to incite hatred, harassment, discrimination and violence."
- 5) The kind of content that will be prohibited under YouTube's new hate speech policies includes videos that claim Jews secretly control the world, that say women are intellectually inferior to men and therefore should be denied certain rights, or that suggest that the white race is superior to another race, a YouTube spokesman said.
- 6) Channels that post some hateful content, but that do not violate YouTube's rules with the majority of their videos, may receive strikes under YouTube's three-strike enforcement system but would not be immediately banned.
- 7) The company also said channels that "repeatedly brush up against our hate speech policies" but don't violate them outright would be removed from YouTube's advertising program, which allows channel owners to share in the advertising revenue their videos generate.

(Attached) Anyone who contradicts the corrupt, communist-run WHO is now in automatic violation of YouTube's policies 04/09/2020 / By Ethan Huff

- 1) YouTube for years has been censoring information that it deems unworthy of consideration, says that any allegation of 5G exacerbating Wuhan coronavirus (COVID-19) infections is a "conspiracy theory," and in violation of the platform's guidelines.
- 2) YouTube has been censoring anyone who questions the official story of the World Health Organization (WHO),
- 3) YouTube has been censoring anyone in opposition to YouTube's ministry of propaganda for the Wuhan coronavirus (COVID-19).
- 4) YouTube's "community guidelines," command total obedience to the globalist entity's decrees about the pandemic.
- 5) It is also no longer permitted to question or speak against the Wuhan coronavirus (COVID-19) itself, such as asking hypothetically whether it's really as serious as authorities are claiming.
- 6) "Now any content that disputes the existence or transmission of COVID-19, as described by the WHO and local health authorities, is in violation of YouTube policies,"
- 7) A YouTube company spokesman is quoted as saying in a recent statement. "This includes conspiracy theories which claim that the symptoms are caused by 5G."

- 8) YouTube has been censoring anyone who promotes medically unsubstantiated methods to prevent the coronavirus in place of seeking medical treatment,

(Attached) Columnist slams YouTube's censorship by World Tribune on May 4, 2020:

- 1) Doctors Dan Erickson and Artin Massihi, from Accelerated Urgent Care in Bakersfield, California, posted a video calling the authoritarian ongoing government-imposed lockdowns unconstitutional activities, and said it was time to reopen America. The video received millions of views. YouTube responded with censorship,
- 2) YouTube explained the censorship this way: "We quickly remove flagged content that violate our Community Guidelines, including content that explicitly disputes the efficacy of local healthy authority recommended guidance on social distancing that may lead others to act against that guidance.

(Attached) Deleted former KGB agent video: YouTube deleted a wildly popular video featuring a former KGB agent detailing how communists have taken over America's culture and government.

(Attached) Carlson Blasts YouTube Over Censorship Carlson Tucker from Fox news:

- 1) There is disagreement in the medical community over how much longer many parts of the country should be under strict lockdown orders. In California, two Bakersfield-area doctors are pushing for Gov. Gavin Newsom to lift the order. Their recommendation came after looking at the statistics from their urgent care facility, which they said showed coronavirus was similar to the flu. Other doctors in the state disagreed. The video, which featured Dr. Daniel Erickson, was viewed millions of times but then was removed for violating YouTube's terms, which Fox News's Tucker Carlson found to be the most troubling aspect of the story.
- 2) "YouTube removed a highly circulated video featuring Dr. Daniel Erickson of Bakersfield, Calif. In the video, Erickson alleged that doctors were encouraged to link deaths to COVID-19 to amplify concerns about the pandemic. It wasn't an accident, YouTube admitted doing it. The company cited a violation of company guidelines and didn't apologize the video was made by a local news station and there was absolutely no reason to remove it other than the fact that it disagreed with those in power. It was a form of dissent from orthodoxy.
- 3) YouTube and its parent company Google have now officially banned dissent, YouTube's CEO Susan Wojcicki said Sunday that content considered "problematic" and that went against the World Health Organization's recommendations would be removed.
- 4) Doctors who were treating patients with the virus have just been banned.
- 5) This is not about science Censorship, never is about science, it's about power. Big technology companies are using this tragedy to increase their power over the population."

(Attached) Anyone who contradicts the corrupt, communist-run WHO is now in automatic violation of YouTube's policies, 04/09/2020 / By Ethan Huff

- 1) The Google-owned video platform, which for years has been censoring information that it deems unworthy of consideration, says that any allegation of 5G exacerbating Wuhan

coronavirus (COVID-19) infections is a “conspiracy theory,” and in violation of the platform’s guidelines.

- 2) Even just questioning the official story of the World Health Organization (WHO), YouTube’s ministry of propaganda for the Wuhan coronavirus (COVID-19), is no longer in line with YouTube’s “community guidelines,” which command total obedience to the globalist entity’s decrees about the pandemic.
- 3) “Now any content that disputes the existence or transmission of COVID-19, as described by the WHO and local health authorities, is in violation of YouTube policies,” a company spokesman is quoted as saying in a recent statement. “This includes conspiracy theories which claim that the symptoms are caused by 5G.”
- 4) According to YouTube, anything other than what the WHO is saying about the Wuhan coronavirus (COVID-19) is “medically unsubstantiated,” and thus not allowed on the YouTube platform because it might interfere with people rushing out to get treatment at the first signs of symptoms.
- 5) “We have clear policies that prohibit videos promoting medically unsubstantiated methods to prevent the coronavirus in place of seeking medical treatment, and we quickly remove videos violating these policies when flagged to us,” the statement from YouTube goes on to explain. “For borderline content that could misinform users in harmful ways, we reduce recommendations. We’ll continue to evaluate the impact of these videos on communities around the world.”
- 6) YouTube recently pulled a London Real video featuring David Icke, who believes that 5G is part of a much larger globalist plot to take over society and control humanity. Icke discussed how people in Europe are now destroying 5G towers, and that an increasing number of people everywhere are opposed to their installation. Whether Icke’s claims are fully true, partially true, or not true at all is beside the point. What’s disturbing is that, once again, YouTube has taken it upon itself to police all content that doesn’t regurgitate the official government narrative on any given topic, in this case the Wuhan coronavirus (COVID-19).

(Attached) YouTube is now banning “wrongthink” by labeling it “hate”... but it’s really just a way to silence anyone who disagrees with the twisted agendas of the radical Left 12/17/2019 / By Ethan Huff

- 1) Just when we thought that YouTube had finally hit rock bottom with its outrageous censorship tactics, along comes yet another company announcement about how YouTube channels and videos that violate the platform’s new “acceptable thoughts” policies will soon, if they haven’t already, be censored or deleted.
- 2) Following line-by-line the supposedly fictitious concepts laid out in George Orwell’s dystopian novel *1984*, YouTube is well on its way towards policing every single thought, idea, sentiment, joke, and even facial expression in the video content published to its platform. And anything that doesn’t meet the corporation’s arbitrary “acceptable thoughts” threshold can now expect to be shadow-banned, de-platformed, demonetized, or banned.
- 3) YouTube CEO Susan Wojcicki on her Twitter account, adding that “we take it very seriously when creators share stories about harassment. Today we announced an update to our harassment policy that will help make YouTube a better place for everyone,” she further added. So, what constitutes “harassment,” exactly? According to YouTube, it’s anything that “hurts our community by making people less inclined to share their opinions and engage with each other.” This “harassment” policy really only applies to content that offends special

interest groups that's routinely catered to by Big Tech. It doesn't apply to Christians who are being harassed by atheists, for instance, or conservatives who are harassed by liberals.

- 4) Using biological fact, that there are only two genders, as one prominent example, is considered by YouTube to be "harassment." It is also considered "harassment" to point out on YouTube that many Drag Queen Story Hour events are being hosted by perverts, pedophiles, and other convicted sex predators who are being allowed easy access to young children in the name of "tolerance" and "pride."
- 5) One Twitter user, responding to Wojcicki's announcement about her company's new "harassment" policies," highlighted all of this using a simple list, which reads as follows:
 - a. Criticism: harassment
 - b. Different opinions: harassment
 - c. Cold hard facts: harassment
 - d. Edgy humor: harassment
 - e. "The line between criticism and 'harassment' is now so blurred, nobody knows where they stand.

GOOGLE

(Attached) Censorship by Google Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia:

- 1) Google and its subsidiary companies, such as YouTube, have removed or omitted information from its services to comply with its company policies, legal demands, and government censorship laws.
- 2) In February 2003, Google stopped showing the advertisements of Oceana, a non-profit organization protesting against a major cruise ship operation's sewage treatment practices. Google cited its editorial policy at the time, stating "Google does not accept advertising if the ad or site advocates against other individuals, groups, or organizations." [4] The policy was later changed.
- 3) In April 2008, Google refused to run ads for a UK Christian group opposed to abortion, explaining that "At this time, Google policy does not permit the advertisement of websites that contain 'abortion and religion'".
- 4) In April 2014, though Google accepts ads from the pro-choice abortion lobbying group NARAL, they have removed ads for some anti-abortion crisis pregnancy centers. Google removed the Web search ads after an investigation by NARAL found evidence that the ads violate Google's policy against deceptive advertising. According to NARAL, people using Google to search for "abortion clinics" got ads advertising crisis pregnancy centers that were in fact anti-abortion. Google said in a statement that it had followed normal company procedures in applying its ad policy standards related to ad relevance, clarity, and accuracy in this case.
- 5) In September 2018, Google has removed from its YouTube website a paid advertisement placed by supporters of Russian opposition urging Russians to participate in a protest set for September 9. Russia's Central Election Commission earlier sent a request to Google to remove the advertisement, saying it violated election laws that call for a "day of silence" on election matters ahead of voting, but the advertisement was blocked even in regions where there is no voting set for September 9 and in regions where authorities have authorized the pension-reform protests.
- 6) In 2002 Google filtered out websites that provided information critical of Scientology.

- 7) Google filters certain words from autocomplete suggestions, describing them as “potentially inappropriate.”
- 8) In mid-2016, Google conducted a two-month standoff with writer Dennis Cooper after deleting his Blogger and Gmail accounts without warning or explanation following a single anonymous complaint. The case drew worldwide media attention, and finally resulted in Google returning Cooper’s content to him.
- 9) In mid-2018, Google permanently barred conspiracy theorist Alex Jones from using its subsidiary company YouTube. Jones’ channel Infowars responded by “accusing the companies of censorship.”
- 10) In mid-2019, Google allegedly suspended Tulsi Gabbard’s advertisements for her presidential campaign, while the candidate was at the height of public interest. Gabbard sued Google for \$50 million in damages.

TWITTER

(Attached) In today’s twisted world, threatening to kill ICE agents is ruled “protected speech” while questioning vaccine safety gets you banned and attacked: By Ethan Huff, 12/26/2019.

(Attached) Why is Twitter Censoring Free Speech? February 10, 2017 By Aaron, There has been a disturbing trend of increasing censorship against free speech on Twitter. This comes not from radicals or extremists on the platform but from Twitter itself. Needless to say the increased Twitter censorship is unsettling.

- 1) Twitter said, “*We stand for freedom of expression and people being able to see all sides of any topic. That’s put in jeopardy when abuse and harassment stifle and silence those voices. We won’t tolerate it and we’re launching new efforts to stop it.*” This makes no sense, as users on an egalitarian platform don’t have the capacity to “stifle and silence” one another. Everyone stands on equal ground. The only actor with the power to silence users is Twitter themselves, and that is, seemingly, exactly what they are doing.
- 2) Twitter said, “*Today, we’re announcing three changes: stopping the creation of new abusive accounts, bringing forward safer search results, and collapsing potentially abusive or low-quality Tweets.*” More vaguely and Orwellian doublespeak; People’s concern here is that this is not about safety or protecting the integrity of the platform, but rather Twitter pushing its own ideological agenda.

(Attached) David Icke is horribly wrong about the coronavirus, but I support his right to speak... DAMN the tech giants for deleting his channels (and mine) 05/07/2020 / By Mike Adams

- Tech giants are deleting channels they don’t agree with

(Attached) Here are the top 10 most outrageous censorship stories of 2019, 12/26/2019 / By JD Heyes

- 1) In July 2020 Google will begin blocking *all* websites that publish truth about alternative cancer treatments, the dangers behind vaccines, and disturbing health facts related to GMO foods.

- 2) Google declares supplements and organics to be a 'lie' and a 'scam' Google struck a blow against health facts and truth again over the summer when it began "censoring all content about organics, homeopathy, naturopathy, chiropractic, herbs, nutrition and supplements."
- 3) Facebook also pledged to block ALL posts questioning the deadly vaccine industry At the request of House Intelligence Committee chairman and lead Trump impeachment hoaxer Adam Schiff (D-Calif.), Facebook announced in February it would soon begin censoring any content that questions the establishment healthcare industry's dogma that 'all vaccines are safe and effective.'
- 4) Amazon prefers Satanism over any films that are critical of the vaccine industry Yes, the e-tailer giant also got into the censorship act this past year when officials declared they banned the sale of anti-vaccine documentaries based on 'sound science and replicable data,' while still allowing people to publish and sell books on "Satanism" — in particular, Satanist books that focus on teenagers.
- 5) Twitter blocked Natural News and the Health Ranger after Adams, the Health Ranger, appeared on the Alex Jones Show to discuss the truth about Twitter founder Jack Dorsey's "criminal fronting for Bitcoin and deep state money laundering," lo and behold he found his channel and those belonging to Natural News blocked, and without explanation.
- 6) The Trump White House announced a Justice Department anti-trust probe into Google, "dozens of tech companies have been disrupted via sweeping internet outages that many are calling the 'internet kill switch.'" The reason for the investigation was the continued censorship by the Big Tech giants of conservative, pro-Trump websites and news organizations.
- 7) Around the same time of the 'kill switch' incident, Facebook permanently banned Natural News from posting any content following "a coordinated, heavily-funded smear campaign against" the news site and its founder. "This is on top of permanent bans of Natural News content from Twitter, YouTube, Pinterest, Google News, Apple, and other techno-fascists that now represent" a massive threat to human freedom.
- 8) Earlier, in February, Apple demanded that Natural News stop publishing factual news and information pertaining to the abortion industry and Satanism, or the Big Tech giant would block Natural News from all Apple devices. "With Democrats now openly pushing infanticide and the legalization of the serial killing of infants, tech giants like Apple are serving as the censorship "speech police" to silence all criticism of the gruesome practice."
- 9) In January, Microsoft unveiled plans to partner with NewsGuard, a startup that aims to censor much of what appears on the Internet that does not comport with Left-wing establishment and globalist agendas. Labeling 'dissent' as "fake news," Microsoft's effort is nothing more than blatant censorship.

In Conclusion, Google, Facebook, Twitter, and Youtube are public networks that perform a public service and have a fiduciary duty and therefore subject to government regulation and antitrust laws. Since the defendants services are user decided, the People have an unalienable right to decide what news is worthy or real on the internet. If the defendants decide for us it is nothing short of mind control and book burning.

(Attached) On May 28, 2020 President Donald J. Trump signed an Executive Order Preventing Online Censorship, stating:

“Free speech is the bedrock of American democracy. Our Founding Fathers protected this sacred right with the First Amendment to the Constitution. The freedom to express and debate ideas is the foundation for all of our rights as a free people. In a country that has long cherished the freedom of expression, We cannot allow a limited number of online platforms to hand pick the speech that Americans may access and convey on the internet. This practice is fundamentally un-American and anti-democratic. When large, powerful social media companies censor opinions with which they disagree, they exercise a dangerous power. Today, many Americans follow the news, stay in touch with friends and family, and share their views on current events through social media and other online platforms. As a result, these platforms function in many ways as a 21st century equivalent of the public square. Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, and YouTube wield immense, if not unprecedented, power to shape the interpretation of public events; to censor, delete, or disappear information; and to control what people see or do not see. Such debate is just as important online as it is in our universities, our town halls, and our homes. It is essential to sustaining our democracy,

In May of 2019, the White House launched a Tech Bias Reporting tool to allow Americans to report incidents of online censorship. In just weeks, the White House received over 16,000 complaints of online platforms censoring or otherwise taking action against users based on their political viewpoints.

Online platforms are engaging in selective censorship that is harming our national discourse. Tens of thousands of Americans have reported, among other troubling behaviors, online platforms “flagging” content as inappropriate, even though it does not violate any stated terms of service; making unannounced and unexplained changes to company policies that have the effect of disfavoring certain viewpoints; and deleting content and entire accounts with no warning, no rationale, and no recourse.

Twitter now selectively decides to place a warning label on certain tweets in a manner that clearly reflects political bias. As recently as last week, Representative Adam Schiff was continuing to mislead his followers by peddling the long-disproved Russian Collusion Hoax, and Twitter did not flag those tweets. Unsurprisingly, its officer in charge of so-called “Site Integrity” has flaunted his political bias in his own tweets. At the same time online platforms are invoking inconsistent, irrational, and groundless justifications to censor or otherwise restrict Americans' speech here at home, several online platforms are profiting from and promoting the aggression and disinformation spread by foreign governments like China.

As a Nation, we must foster and protect diverse viewpoints in today's digital communications environment where all Americans can and should have a voice. We must seek transparency and accountability from online platforms, and encourage standards and tools to protect and preserve the integrity and openness of American discourse and freedom of expression.

47 USC 230(c) was designed to address early court decisions holding that, if an online platform restricted access to some content posted by others, it would thereby become a “publisher” of all the content posted on its site for purposes of torts such as defamation. As the title of section 230(c) makes clear, the provision provides limited liability

“protection” to a provider of an interactive computer service (such as an online platform) that engages in “Good Samaritan’ blocking” of harmful content. In particular, the Congress sought to provide protections for online platforms that attempted to protect minors from harmful content and intended to ensure that such providers would not be discouraged from taking down harmful material. The provision was also intended to further the express vision of the Congress that the internet is a “forum for a true diversity of political discourse.” 47 U.S.C. 230(a)(3). The limited protections provided by the statute should be construed with these purposes in mind.

In particular, subparagraph (c)(2) expressly addresses protections from “civil liability” and specifies that an interactive computer service provider may not be made liable “on account of” its decision in “good faith” to restrict access to content that it considers to be “obscene, lewd, lascivious, filthy, excessively violent, harassing or otherwise objectionable.” It is the policy of the United States to ensure that, to the maximum extent permissible under the law, this provision is not distorted to provide liability protection for online platforms that -- far from acting in “good faith” to remove objectionable content -- instead engage in deceptive or pre-textual actions (often contrary to their stated terms of service) to stifle viewpoints with which they disagree.

Section 230 was not intended to allow a handful of companies to grow into titans controlling vital avenues for our national discourse under the guise of promoting open forums for debate, and then to provide those behemoths blanket immunity when they use their power to censor content and silence viewpoints that they dislike.

When an interactive computer service provider removes or restricts access to content and its actions do not meet the criteria of subparagraph (c)(2)(A), it is engaged in editorial conduct. It is the policy of the United States that such a provider should properly lose the limited liability shield of subparagraph (c)(2)(A) and be exposed to liability like any traditional editor and publisher that is not an online provider.

The conditions under which an action restricting access to or availability of material is not “taken in good faith” within the meaning of subparagraph (c)(2)(A) of section 230, particularly whether actions can be “taken in good faith” if they are deceptive, pre-textual, or inconsistent with a provider's terms of service; or taken after failing to provide adequate notice, reasoned explanation, or a meaningful opportunity to be heard.

Federal Review of Unfair or Deceptive Acts or Practices. (a) It is the policy of the United States that large online platforms, such as Twitter and Facebook, as the critical means of promoting the free flow of speech and ideas today, should not restrict protected speech. The Supreme Court has noted that social media sites, as the modern public square, “can provide perhaps the most powerful mechanisms available to a private citizen to make his or her voice heard.” *Packingham v. North Carolina*, 137 S. Ct. 1730, 1737 (2017).”

WHEREFORE, We the People, via the Unified United States Common Law Grand Jury, being more than 8600 People sue the defendants on behalf of all the People. In *Birsdall*, the Supreme Court wrote that “*the amount awarded shall be precisely commensurate with the injury suffered, neither more nor less.*”

We the People, via the Declaration of Independence, ordained a government by "consent of the governed." Thomas Jefferson said, "An enlightened citizenry is indispensable for the proper functioning of a republic. Self-government is not possible unless the citizens are educated sufficiently to enable them to exercise oversight. It is therefore imperative that the nation see to it that a suitable education be provided for all its citizens.... Educate and inform the whole mass of the people... They are the only sure reliance for the preservation of our liberty."

During the 20th Century government, via the "Deep State," phased out that suitable education. Today our children, in government funded schools, are being indoctrinated into socialism under the guise of democracy. Hollywood, the mainstream media, and social media giants, namely the defendants, reinforce that socialist agenda thereby destroying, in the minds of our children, the just Republic our founding fathers pledged their lives, fortunes, and sacred honor to secure. Along with so many patriots in the past centuries that have given their lives also to secure our heritage, the "blessings of liberty!"

The damages are incalculable and the only solution to counteract the assault upon our "Republic and Heritage" is that suitable education that Jefferson spoke about for all its citizens. We the People "must" educate and inform the whole mass of the people. National Liberty Alliance by the power of the "widows mite" have been facilitating for the organizing, communication, and education for the Common Law Grand and Petit Juries, the elected committeeman, the militia and our Sheriffs at the grassroots level, in all 3133 counties. The Common Law "demands" that for every injury there must be a remedy. It is therefore a just remedy that these billion dollar giants, that have deliberately poisoned the minds of the People, should fund the restoration of the Peoples' Heritage. Alphabet Inc. is worth about \$517.79 billion, Google about \$200 billion, YouTube about \$86.22 billion, Facebook about \$527 billion and Twitter about \$4.4 billion. Collectively the defendants are valued at over a trillion dollars. Therefore, we believe an appropriate penalty for the injury suffered would be to restore the People by informing and educating them. Plaintiffs demand that the defendants cease from restricting free speech over the internet and fund a re-education program, via National Liberty Alliance for the People at a cost of four billion dollars.


Seal Dutchess NY, June 15, 2020


John Vidurek, Grand Jury Foreman

NOTARY

In New York State, Dutchess County, on this 15 day of June, 2020, before me, the undersigned notary public, personally appeared John Vidurek, to me known to be the living man described herein, who executed the forgoing instrument and has sworn before me that (s)he executed the same as their free-will act and deed.

(Notary seal)



Notary



MEDIA MONOPOLY

<http://www.corporations.org/media/#monopoly#monopoly>

In 1983, 50 corporations controlled the vast majority of all news media in the U.S. At the time, Ben Bagdikian was called "alarmist" for pointing this out in his book, *The Media Monopoly*. In his 4th edition, published in 1992, he wrote "In the U.S., fewer than two dozen of these extraordinary creatures own and operate 90% of the mass media" — controlling almost all of America's newspapers, magazines, TV and radio stations, books,



records, movies, videos, wire services and photo agencies. He predicted then that eventually this number would fall to about half a dozen companies. This was greeted with skepticism at the time. When the 6th edition of *The Media Monopoly* was published in 2000, the number had fallen to six. Since then, there have been more mergers and the scope has expanded to include new media like the Internet market. More than 1 in 4 Internet users

in the U.S. now log in with AOL Time-Warner, the world's largest media corporation.

In 2004, Bagdikian's revised and expanded book, *The New Media Monopoly*, shows that only 5 huge corporations — Time Warner, Disney, Murdoch's News Corporation, Bertelsmann of Germany, and Viacom (formerly CBS) — now control most of the media industry in the U.S. General Electric's NBC is a close sixth.

Other Major Players:

AT&T (TCI) - Recently acquired by AT&T, TCI's hold on cable, internet and local phone services contributed to \$7.6 billion in 1997 revenues. TCI is the second-largest US cable television system provider, and it has 10% ownership of Time-Warner/Turner. The company owns all or part of USA Network, Sci-Fi Network, E!, Court TV, Starz! and Starz! 2, Black Entertainment Television, BET on Jazz, BET Movies/Starz! 3, CNN, TNT, Headline News, Prime Sports Channel, The Learning Channel, Discovery Channel, QVC, Q2, Fox Sports Net, The Travel Channel, Prevue Channel, Animal Planet, The Box, Telemundo, International Channel, Encore, MSG Network, Action Pay-per-view, and the Home Shopping Network.

Sony - Sony's main media interests, earning \$9 billion in 1997 sales, are in film and television production, movie theaters and music.

Universal (Seagram) - In addition to Universal Studios, with its production facilities and theme parks, the company owns the USA and Sci-Fi cable networks.

Parent Company	General Electric \$100.5 billion 1998 revenues	Time Warner \$25.8 billion 1998 revenues	The Walt Disney Co. \$33 billion 1998 revenues	Viacom \$18.9 billion 1998 revenues	Newspaper \$13 billion 1998 revenues		
Background	GE/NBC ranks No. 1 on the Fortune 500. Prior to its merger with NBC and an alliance with Liberty, GE specialized in electronics. The post-merger many New York sports teams have new owners. Notable stakes in many popular websites including: Yahoo.com and 24Hours.	The largest media corporation in the world. Time Warner owns film and music production companies, theme parks, sports teams, magazines, websites and book publishers as well as Turner Broadcasting.	With its 1995 merger with Capital Cities/ABC, Disney has become a fully-integrated media giant. In addition to its theme parks, the company profits from retail outlets, magazines, book publishers, websites, motion pictures, sports teams, TV events, radio, music and newspapers.	Viacom's purchase of Paramount CBS and Entertainment Weekly enables them to use cable, pay-per-view, movies, comic books, theme parks, music publishing and book publishing to cross-market their products. Broadcasting alone brings in over \$6 billion in revenues.	CEO Rupert Murdoch's wife has inspired respect and fear, and it has also made his multinational ventures in publishing, television and satellite services very successful. The company owns 20th Century Fox, the New York Post, the London Times, TV Guide, many magazines, the LA Dodgers and five New York sports teams.		
Networks Owned	NBC includes programming, news and more than 73 TV and radio stations.	TURNER BROADCASTING includes sports teams, programming, production, retail, book publishing and multimedia.	WB Television Network	ABC includes ABC Radio, ABC Video and ABC Network News	CBS includes stations, CBS Radio, CBS Teletext and CBS Network News	UPN includes programming and TV stations (50%)	FOX includes programming and stations
Cable Channels	Owns 25-30% of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ A & E (with Disney and Fox) □ American Movie Classics (25%) □ Biography Channel (with Disney and Hearst) □ Bravo (50%) □ Bravo International □ CNBC □ Court TV (with Time Warner) □ Fox Sports Net □ History Channel (with Disney and Hearst) □ Independent Film Channel □ MSNBC (50%) □ National Geographic Worldwide □ News Sport □ Prime □ Prism (with Rainbow, a subsidiary of Cablevision, and Liberty Media, a subsidiary of TCI) □ Romance Classics □ Sports Channel Cincinnati, Chicago, Florida, New England, Paris, Ohio, Philadelphia 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ HBO (75%) □ Eliaemax □ HBO Direct Broadcast □ Court TV (50% with GE) □ TBS Superstation □ Turner Classic Movies □ TNT □ Cartoon Network □ Comedy Central (27.5% with Viacom) □ Sci-Fi Channel □ OVATION (50%) □ Weekend Information Television (WIT) (partial) □ TVKO (75%) □ 4 regional 811-news channels □ CNN □ CNN/NI (with Sports Illustrated) □ CNN/i (cable network) □ CNN/Real □ Headline News □ Sportsouth □ CNN International □ CNN Airport network 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Disney Channel □ Disney Channel (58 hours/week syndicated programming) □ Toon Disney □ Touchstone Television □ A&E (27.5% with Hearst and GE) □ Lifetime Network (50%) □ ESPN (50% with Hearst) □ ESPN2 (50% with Hearst) □ ESPN Classic (50% with Hearst) □ ESPN World (50% with Hearst) □ ESPNNews (50% with Hearst) □ Duets VHS Television □ Biography Channel (with GE and Hearst) □ History Channel (27.5% with Hearst and GE) □ Classic Sports Network □ E! (50%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Nickelodeon □ MTV □ NBC Music Television □ VH1 □ Showtime □ Night at Nite TVLand □ Paramount Network Comedy Central (50% with Time Warner) □ TNT: The Nashville Network □ Movie Channel □ FLEX □ All News Channel (50%) □ Knowledge Channel (45%) □ Midwest Sports Channel □ CBS Teletext (30%) □ Home Team Sports (50% with News Corporation) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Fox Family Channel (50%) □ Fox News Channel □ 88 (50% with TCI; Liberty Media) □ FOX (50% with TCI; Liberty Media) □ Fox Sports Net (50% with GE and Hearst) □ The National Geographic Channel (50%) □ TNT TV Partnership □ Regional networks, including TV Guide Channel and Fox Sports New York 		

Here are the top 10 most outrageous censorship stories of 2019

12/26/2019 / By JD Heyes

<https://youtube.censorship.com/2019-12-26-top-10-most-outrageous-censorship-stories-of-2019.html>



The Left-wing establishment media took a big step this year in becoming 'official state-run media,' completely throwing in with the Democrat Party and going all-out to attack and trash President Donald Trump and his supporters.

But when the corporate-run media outlets weren't defiling Trump's reputation with lies fed to them by the deep state, they were doing their best to propagandize against truth on many levels and with various subjects.

Mostly, that involved censoring facts through acts of omission.

With that, and after careful review, we bring you 10 of the most egregious and outrageous examples of censorship and lying of the past year.

1. Google to begin blocking all anti-cancer, 'anti-vax,' and anti-GMO websites

As exclusively reported by *Natural News*' founder and editor Mike Adams in July, search behemoth Google will begin blocking *all* websites that publish truth about alternative cancer treatments, the dangers behind vaccines, and disturbing health facts related to GMO foods.

Because we can't have free exchanges of ideas and information when such exchanges disrupt the status quo with facts the healthcare industry doesn't want you to know.

Google declares supplements and organics to be a 'lie' and a 'scam'

Google struck a blow against health facts and truth again over the summer when it began "censoring all content about organics, homeopathy, naturopathy, chiropractic, herbs, nutrition and supplements." Adams reported, citing an analysis of data from Sanyer Ji, founder of GreenMedInfo.

3. Facebook also pledged to block ALL posts questioning the deadly vaccine industry

At the request of House Intelligence Committee chairman and lead Trump impeachment hoaxer Adam Schiff (D-Calif.), Facebook announced in February it would soon begin censoring any content that questions the establishment healthcare industry's dogma that 'all vaccines are safe and effective.'

So much for that First Amendment thingy.

4. Amazon prefers satanism over any films that are critical of the vaccine industry

Yes, the e-tailer giant also got into the censorship act this past year when officials declared they banned the sale of anti-vaccine documentaries based on 'sound science and replicable data,' while still allowing people to publish and sell books on "Satanism" — in particular, satanist books that focus on teenagers.

That Jeff Bezos...what a guy. It's almost as though he wants to oversee the destruction of truth and the free exchange of ideas while promoting tyranny and authoritarianism. And censorship.

And this guy owns the Washington Post.

5. Twitter blocked Natural News and the Health Ranger

After Adams, the Health Ranger, appeared on the Alex Jones Show to discuss the truth about Twitter founder Jack Dorsey's "criminal fronting for Bitcoin and deep state money laundering," to and behold he found his channel and those belonging to Natural News blocked, and without explanation.

Dorsey was pushing a Lightning Labs project that was, at the time, working to push a new protocol into Bitcoin, but he didn't discuss it on the air with host Joe Rogan — who never asked the Twitter CEO about that massive conflict of interest.

6. Did the Trump administration send a warning to Big Tech?

In June, Adams reported that shortly after the Trump White House announced a Justice Department anti-trust probe into Google, "dozens of tech companies have been disrupted via sweeping internet outages that many are calling the 'internet kill switch.'"

The reason for the investigation was the continued censorship by the Big Tech giants of conservative, pro-Trump websites and news organizations. Maybe the 'kill switch' was the administration's way of saying, 'Stop messing with us or we'll put you out of business,' Adams intimated.

7. Facebook banned Natural News

Around the same time of the "kill switch" incident, Facebook permanently banned Natural News from posting any content following "a coordinated, heavily-funded smear campaign against" the news site and its founder, Adams. "This is on top of permanent bans of Natural News content from Twitter, YouTube, Pinterest, Google News, Apple, and other techno-fascists that now represent" a massive threat to human freedom.

8. Apple threatened permanent banning as well

Earlier, in February, Apple demanded that Natural News stop publishing factual news and information pertaining to the abortion industry and Satanism, or the Big Tech giant would block Natural News from all Apple devices.

"With Democrats now openly pushing infanticide and the legalization of the serial killing of infants, tech giants like Apple are serving as the censorship "speech police" to silence all criticism of the grotesque practice," Adams wrote.

9. Even "tolerant" Canada grew more intolerant

Police arrested Pastor David Lynn and charged him with "disturbing the peace" for simply preaching the word of the Lord on a street corner (where, presumably, Canada's laws recognizing the freedom of speech and expression still apply). This was *after* he was approached and harassed by Leftists.

10. Microsoft gets in on the censorship too

In January, Microsoft unveiled plans to partner with NewsGuard, a startup that aims to censor much of what appears on the Internet that does not comport with Left-wing establishment and globalist agendas. Labelling dissent as "fake news," Microsoft's effort is nothing more than blatant censorship.

Tagged Under: 2019, Amazon anti-vaxxers, biased, Big Tech, Censored, Censorship, establishment media, Facebook, Glitch, GMOs, Google, independent media, Microsoft, Orwellian, President Trump, Suppressed, tech giants, Trump supporters, Twisted, Twitter, vaccine truth

Community Standards

<https://www.facebook.com/communitystandards/>

COVID-19: Community Standards Updates and Protections

As people around the world confront this unprecedented public health emergency, we want to make sure that our Community Standards protect people from harmful content and new types of abuse related to COVID-19. We're working to remove content that has the potential to contribute to real-world harm, including through our policies prohibiting coordination of harm, sale of medical masks and related goods, hate speech, bullying and harassment and misinformation that contributes to the risk of imminent violence or physical harm.

As the situation evolves, we continue to look at content on the platform, assess speech trends, and engage with experts, and will provide additional policy guidance when appropriate to keep the members of our community safe during this crisis.

INTRODUCTION: Every day, people use Facebook to share their experiences, connect with friends and family, and build communities. We are a service for more than two billion people to freely express themselves across countries and cultures and in dozens of languages.

We recognize how important it is for Facebook to be a place where people feel empowered to communicate, and we take seriously our role in keeping abuse off our service. That's why we've developed a set of Community Standards that outline what is and is not allowed on Facebook. Our policies are based on feedback from our community and the advice of experts in fields such as technology, public safety and human rights. To ensure that everyone's voice is valued, we take great care to craft policies that are inclusive of different views and beliefs, in particular those of people and communities that might otherwise be overlooked or marginalized.

REITERATING OUR COMMITMENT TO VOICE

The goal of our Community Standards has always been to create a place for expression and give people a voice. This has not and will not change. Building community and bringing the world closer together depends on people's ability to share diverse views, experiences, ideas and information. We want people to be able to talk openly about the issues that matter to them, even if some may disagree or find them objectionable. In some cases, we allow content which would otherwise go against our Community Standards - if it is newsworthy and in the public interest. We do this only after weighing the public interest value against the risk of harm and we look to international human rights standards to make these judgments.

Our commitment to expression is paramount, but we recognize the internet creates new and increased opportunities for abuse. For these reasons, when we limit expression, we do it in service of one or more the following values:

Authenticity: We want to make sure the content people are seeing on Facebook is authentic. We believe that authenticity creates a better environment for sharing, and that's why we don't want people using Facebook to misrepresent who they are or what they're doing.

7. Facebook banned Natural News

Around the same time of the 'kill system' posts, Natural News was posting any content following the lead of its founder, Adams. "This is on top of our presence on Pinterest, Google News, Apple, and YouTube. We have freedom of expression."

8. Apple threatened permanent removal of apps

Earlier, in February, Apple threatened to remove apps pertaining to the abortion from its App Store.

"With Democrats' support, the practice of removing apps from the App Store is a clear violation of the First Amendment."

9. Even the police

Police work is essential to public safety and the well-being of our communities.

Community Standards
www.facebook.com/communitystandards

we want to make sure that we're not promoting or supporting any kind of violence or physical harm, including hate speech, threats, and harassment. We also want to make sure that we're not promoting or supporting any kind of violence or physical harm, including hate speech, threats, and harassment.

Expression that threatens people based on race, ethnicity, or religion is not allowed on Facebook.

and information. Privacy gives people the ability to control who sees their posts on Facebook and to connect more easily.

We expect that people will respect the privacy of others.

and to all types of content. They're not. Some content that we've considered hateful may still be different things or affect people differently. We work hard to account for these differences in their expression. In the case of a violation, we'll take a look with our Community Standards team.

groups, Profiles, individual content, and pages. We give you the choice by allowing them to block, unfollow, or hide content.

Community Standards vary depending on the severity of the violation. For instance, we may warn someone for a first violation, but if they violate again, we may restrict their ability to post on Facebook or disable their profile. We take enforcement when we believe there is a genuine risk of physical harm or a direct threat to someone's safety.

Community Standards are a guide for what is and isn't allowed on Facebook. It is in this spirit that we ask members of the Facebook community to follow these guidelines.

Please note that the English version of the Community Standards reflects the most up to date set of the policies and should be used as the master document.

safety: We are committed to making Facebook a safe place. Expression that threatens the potential to intimidate, exclude or silence others and isn't allowed on Facebook.

privacy: We are committed to protecting personal privacy and information. Privacy gives freedom to be themselves, and to choose how and when to share on Facebook and to connect more easily.

dignity: We believe that all people are equal in dignity and rights. We expect that people will respect the dignity of others and not harass or degrade others.

Our Community Standards apply to everyone, all around the world, and to all types of content. They're designed to be comprehensive – for example, content that might not be considered hateful may still be moved for violating a different policy. We recognize that words mean different things or affect people differently depending on their local community, language, or background. We work hard to account for these nuances while also applying our policies consistently and fairly to people and their expression. In the case of certain policies, we require more information and/or context to enforce in line with our Community Standards.

People can report potentially violating content, including Pages, Groups, Profiles, individual content, and comments. We also give people control over their own experience by allowing them to block, unfollow or hide people and posts.

The consequences for violating our Community Standards vary depending on the severity of the violation and the person's history on the platform. For instance, we may warn someone for a first violation, but if they continue to violate our policies, we may restrict their ability to post on Facebook or disable their profile. We also may notify law enforcement when we believe there is a genuine risk of physical harm or a direct threat to public safety.

Our Community Standards are a guide for what is and isn't allowed on Facebook. It is in this spirit that we ask members of the Facebook community to follow these guidelines.

Please note that the English version of the Community Standards reflects the most up to date set of the policies and should be used as the master document.

Angry about Facebook censorship? Wait until you hear about the news feed

Alex Hern [@alexhern](#)

<https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2016/may/31/facebook-censorship-news-feed-human-curators>



Peeved about Facebook's curation of trending topics? Its news feed is reinventing censorship for a technological age, and humans need not apply

Wed 11 May 2016 10:37 EDT Last modified on Wed 31 May 2017 12:03 EDT



Don't look here. Photograph: Tracey Nearmy/AAP

Bad news: Facebook is censoring the internet every day, warping your understanding of the world around you in benefit its corporate interests, and fundamentally changing the media landscape in a potentially apocalyptic fashion.

Good news: that has little to nothing to do with the fact that the human curators of its trending topics feature are a bit sniffy about linking to Breitbart News.

The most surprising thing about Facebook's trending stories isn't that the human editors behind them occasionally exercise their own judgement in which stories they do or don't link to: it's that even with humans working directly on the feature, it's still awful. The output of the feature is so bad that I and many others assumed it must be entirely algorithmic: how else would you end up with bizarre gnomic statements like this, taken verbatim from the "science and technology" section of my feed today:

Facebook is a hotbed of censorship, just try to post a picture of Aboriginal women in traditional dress

"Quebec, Canada: Parts of Province Experience Snowfall, Report Says"

But no, Facebook has an entire team of writers working on these statements, according to a report from [Gizmodo](#), and those writers are apparently encouraged to focus on mainstream news sites such as the BBC and CNN over fringe right-wing outlets like Breitbart or Newsmax.

Facebook, for its part, [denies censoring trending topics](#), saying that it wouldn't even be "technically feasible" to do what the whistleblower alleged. That hasn't stopped outrage at the report reaching the highest levels: [Republican Senator John Thune spoke out on Tuesday](#), asking the site to explain itself.

If Thune is outraged about stories not appearing on trending topics – a small sidebar which has an unclear influence on web traffic, fails to shape discussion, and is buried on mobile devices – wait until he finds out about the news feed.

The jewel in Facebook's crown is a hotbed of censorship. Don't believe me? Try to post a picture of Aboriginal women in traditional dress — that is, *sopless* — on your Facebook feed and see how long it lasts.

The company's moderation team is notorious for its heavy-handed approach to topics like nudity, even as it also gets slated by governments worldwide for not removing and reporting content glorifying terrorism rapidly enough.

But being a community moderator at Facebook is a thankless task. The work, often outsourced to companies like Manila-based contractor TaskUs, is performed with little remuneration or training. And even the best-paid highly skilled employees would have trouble drawing a consistent plan of action out of Facebook's vague attempts at drawing up community standards.



Facebook Twitter Pinterest

Facebook's news feed was born in 2006, when the social network was growing into a global phenomenon. Photograph: Justin Sullivan/Getty Images

Say what you like about moderation, though: at least you can see it happening. What seems so disturbing about the alteration of trending topics is that the sites which were kept off the list had no

way of knowing that they had even had a chance. There's no reports feeding back why a curator decided to place or leave a story. It's an opaque system.

Except, of course, that we can speak to former curators of trending topics to find out what they did and didn't post.

With the news feed, there's no such luck. The algorithm that drives it makes just as many editorial choices as the trending topic curators, but you can't interview it to ask why. It will never be fired and decide to speak out about its decisions under the cloak of anonymity. Instead, it just sits there, day in day out, totally dictating the content seen by more than a billion users of the biggest social network in the world.

These decisions don't feel outrageous, because Facebook sells them under the veneer of neutrality.

Perhaps because of that, the majority of Facebook users don't even realise that the news feed is edited at all. A 2015 study suggested that more than 60% of Facebook users are entirely unaware of any algorithmic curation on Facebook at all: "They believed every single story from their friends and followed pages appeared in their news feed", the authors wrote.

The news feed algorithm takes in so many signals when deciding what should be promoted and what should be buried that it's likely the case that there is no one person at Facebook who can list them all. But we know some choices the algorithm makes: it promotes live video as much as possible, and pre-recorded video almost as heavily — although in both cases, only if the video is delivered through Facebook's own platform.

It pushes articles that you spend a long time reading, as well as links posted by your closest friends, over the alternative. If you run a business page on the site, it will show your posts to a tiny fraction of people who've subscribed, and then ask for cash to show it to anyone else.

These decisions don't feel outrageous, because Facebook sells them under the veneer of neutrality. Articles with a longer read time aren't shown because Facebook made an editorial decision that you shouldn't read short pieces; instead it's because "the time people choose to spend reading or watching content they clicked on from news feed is an important signal that the story was interesting to them". And so Facebook promotes stories with a high read time, because it wants the news feed to be full of "interesting" stories.

You could, of course, argue that the decision to focus on interesting stories, as opposed to important, or pleasing, or humorous ones is itself an editorial decision.

But that argument probably wouldn't be very interesting. So no one would read it, because it wouldn't show up on Facebook. Oh well.

Facebook doesn't really believe in free speech. What they believe in (and actively practice) is censorship



By L. Brent Bozell III | Fox News

<https://www.foxnews.com/opinion/facebook-doesnt-really-believe-in-free-speech-what-they-believe-in-and-actively-practice-is-censorship>

Facebook apologizes after temporarily banning Reverend Franklin Graham

Reverend Graham responds. — It's a new year, but Americans are fighting a battle as old as the nation itself. It's the battle to preserve our free speech and for the first time we're losing — badly.

The new front lines of this fight are on social media — Facebook, Twitter, Google, Instagram and others.

2.5 billion people use at least one of Facebook's apps, making it probably the most important social media platform. Unfortunately, its employees, from the CEO on down, don't really believe in free speech. They believe in and actively practice censorship on a scale almost unimaginable a few years ago.

FACEBOOK, OTHER TECH GIANTS SHOULD STOP SUPPRESSING SPEECH

Facebook's embattled founder and CEO Mark Zuckerberg and its Chief Operating Officer Sheryl Sandberg seem determined to make the situation worse. After declaring to Congress their commitment to neutrality, they made end-of-year pronouncements that both promised more censorship, and appeased the far left by vowing to involve them with "new products, features and policies."

Facebook is now openly antagonistic toward the right. Posts aren't just blocked by humans who decide what they do or don't like; they are blocked by computer programs designed by humans to ensure liberal sensibilities are not offended. The New York Times says the company is monitoring "billions of posts per day in over 100 languages." That makes what Facebook is doing almost impossible to track, until it's too late.

The Times described a global network with more than 15,000 employees assessing content based on rulebooks more than 1,400 pages long. The rules secretly designate groups as hate organizations and are so specific they even ban certain emoji use. Hate speech mandates alone run "200 jargon-filled, head-spinning pages," wrote The Times.

Facebook is now openly antagonistic inward the right. Posts aren't just blocked by humans who decide what they do or don't like; they are blocked by computer programs designed by humans to ensure liberal sensibilities are not offended.

The result is chaos. There's no consistency in what Facebook bans or doesn't ban — except that conservatives suffer. Pro-life, pro-gun and pro-Trump content all run afoul of Facebook's sacred hate speech

These decisions don't feel outrageous, because Facebook sells them under the veneer of neutrality. Articles with a longer read time aren't shown because Facebook made an editorial decision that you shouldn't read short pieces; unless it's because "the time people choose to spend reading or watching content they clicked on from news feeds is an important signal that the story was interesting to them". And so Facebook promotes stories with a high read time, because it wants the news feed to be full of "interesting" stories.

You could, of course, argue that the decision to focus on interesting stories, as opposed to important, or amusing, or humorous ones is itself an editorial decision.

But that argument probably wouldn't be very interesting. So no one would read it, because it wouldn't show up on Facebook. Oh well.

The jewel in Facebook's crown is a hotbed of censorship. Don't believe me? Try to post a picture of Aboriginal women in traditional dress – that is, topless – on your Facebook feed and see how long it lasts.

The company's moderation team is notorious for its heavy-handed approach to topics like nudity, even as it also gets slated by governments worldwide for not removing and reporting content glorifying terrorism rapidly enough.

But being a community moderator at Facebook is a thankless task. The work, often outsourced to companies like Manila-based contractor TaskUs, is performed with little remuneration or training. And even the best-paid highly skilled employees would have trouble drawing a consistent plan of action out of Facebook's vague attempts at drawing up community standards.



Facebook Twitter Pinterest

Facebook's news feed was born in 2006, when the social network was growing into a global phenomenon. Photograph: Justin Sullivan/Getty Images

Say what you like about moderation, though: at least you can see it happening. What seems so disturbing about the alteration of trending topics is that the sites which were kept off the list had no way of knowing that they had even had a chance. There's no reports feeding back why a curator decided to place or leave a story. It's an opaque system.

Except, of course, that we can speak to former curators of trending topics to find out what they did and didn't post.

With the news feed, there's no such luck. The algorithm that drives it makes just as many editorial choices as the trending topic curators, but you can't interview it to ask why. It will never be fired and decide to speak out about its decisions under the cloak of anonymity. Instead, it just sits there, day in day out, unally dictating the content seen by more than a billion users of the biggest social network in the world.

These decisions don't feel outrageous, because Facebook sells them under the veneer of neutrality

Perhaps because of that, the majority of Facebook users don't even realise that the news feed is edited at all. A 2015 study suggested that more than 60% of Facebook users are entirely unaware of any algorithmic curation on Facebook at all: "They believed every single story from their friends and followed pages appeared in their news feed," the authors wrote.

The news feed algorithm takes in so many signals when deciding what should be promoted and what should be buried that it's likely the case that there is no one person at Facebook who can list them all. But we know some choices the algorithm makes: it promotes live video as much as possible, and pre-recorded video almost as heavily – although in both cases, only if the video is delivered through Facebook's own platform.

It pushes articles that you spend a long time reading, as well as links posted by your closest friends, over the alternative. If you run a business page on the site, it will show your posts to a tiny fraction of people who've subscribed, and then ask for cash to show it to anyone else.

Angry about Facebook censorship? Wait until you hear about the news feed

Alex Hem (@alexhem)

<https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2016/may/11/facebook-censorship-news-feed-trending-topics>



Peevish about Facebook's curation of trending topics? Its news feed is reinventing censorship for a technological age, and humans need not apply

Wed 11 May 2016 10:37 EDT Last modified on Wed 31 May 2017 12:03 EDT



Don't look here. Photograph: Tracey Nearny/AAP

Bad news: Facebook is censoring the internet every day, warping your understanding of the world around you to benefit its corporate interests, and fundamentally changing the media landscape in a potentially apocalyptic fashion.

Good news: that has little to nothing to do with the fact that the human curators of its trending topics feature are a bit sniffy about linking to Breitbart News.

The most surprising thing about Facebook's trending stories isn't that the human editors behind them occasionally exercise their own judgement in which stories they do or don't link to; it's that even with humans working directly on the feature, it's still awful. The output of the feature is so bad that I and many others assumed it must be entirely algorithmic: how else would you end up with bizarre gnomish statements like this, taken verbatim from the "science and technology" section of my feed today:

Facebook is a hatred of censorship. Just try to post a picture of Aboriginal women in traditional dress.

"Quebec, Canada: Parts of Province Experience Snowfall, Report Says"

But no. Facebook has an entire team of writers working on these statements, according to a report from Gizmodo, and those writers are apparently encouraged to focus on mainstream news sites such as the BBC and CNN over fringe right-wing outlets like Breitbart or Newsmax.

Facebook, for its part, denies censoring trending topics, saying that it wouldn't even be "technically feasible" to do what the whistleblower alleged. That hasn't stopped outrage at the report reaching the highest levels: Republican Senator John Thune spoke out on Tuesday, asking the site to explain itself.

If Thune is outraged about stories not appearing on trending topics – a small sidebar which has an unclear influence on web traffic, fails to shape discussion, and is buried on mobile devices – wait until he finds out about the news feed.

The jewel in Facebook's crown is a hothead of censorship. Don't believe me? Try to post a picture of Aboriginal women in traditional dress – that is, topless – on your Facebook feed and see how long it lasts.

The company's moderation team is notorious for its heavy-handed approach to topics like nudity, even as it also gets stated by governments worldwide for not removing and reporting content glorifying terrorism rapidly enough.

But being a community moderator at Facebook is a thankless task. The work, often outsourced to companies like Manila-based contractor TaskUs, is performed with little remuneration or training. And even the best-paid highly skilled employees would have trouble drawing a consistent plan of action out of Facebook's vague attempts at drawing up community standards.



Facebook Twitter Pinterest

Facebook's news feed was born in 2006, when the social network was growing into a global phenomenon. Photograph: Justin Sullivan/Getty Images

Say what you like about moderation, though: at least you can see it happening. What seems so disturbing about the alteration of trending topics is that the sites which were kept off the list had no way of knowing that they had even had a chance. There's no reports feeding back why a curator decided to place or leave a story. It's an opaque system.

Except, of course, that we can speak to former curators of trending topics to find out what they did and didn't post.

With the news feed, there's no such luck. The algorithm that drives it makes just as many editorial choices as the trending topic curators, but you can't interview it to ask why. It will never be fired and decide to speak out about its decisions under the cloak of anonymity. Instead, it just sits there, day in day out, totally dictating the content seen by more than a billion users of the biggest social network in the world.

These decisions don't feel outrageous, because Facebook sells them under the veneer of neutrality.

Perhaps because of that, the majority of Facebook users don't even realise that the news feed is edited at all. A 2015 study suggested that more than 60% of Facebook users are entirely unaware of any algorithmic curation on Facebook at all: "They believed every single story from their friends and followed pages appeared in their news feed", the authors wrote.

The news feed algorithm takes in so many signals when deciding what should be promoted and what should be buried that it's likely the case that there is no one person at Facebook who can list them all. But we know some choices the algorithm makes: it promotes live video as much as possible, and pre-recorded video almost as heavily – although in both cases, only if the video is delivered through Facebook's own platform.

It pushes articles that you spend a long time reading, as well as links posted by your closest friends, over the alternative. If you run a business page on the site, it will show your posts to a tiny fraction of people who've subscribed, and then ask for cash to show it to anyone else.

These decisions don't feel outrageous, because Facebook sells them under the veneer of neutrality. Articles with a longer read time aren't shown because Facebook made an editorial decision that you shouldn't read short pieces; instead it's because "the time people choose to spend reading or watching content they clicked on from news feed is an important signal that the story was interesting to them". And so Facebook promotes stories with a high read time, because it wants the news feed to be full of "interesting" stories.

You could, of course, argue that the decision to focus on interesting stories, as opposed to important, or pleasing, or humorous ones is itself an editorial decision.

But that argument probably wouldn't be very interesting. So no one would read it, because it wouldn't show up on Facebook. Oh well.

Facebook doesn't really believe in free speech. What they believe in (and actively practice) is censorship



By L. Brent Brwell III | Fox News

<https://www.foxnews.com/opinion/facebook-doesnt-really-believe-in-free-speech-what-they-believe-in-and-actively-practice-is-censorship>

Facebook apologizes after temporarily banning Reverend Franklin Graham

Reverend Graham responds. - It's a new year, but Americans are fighting a battle as old as the nation itself. It's the battle to preserve our free speech and for the first time we're losing — badly.

The new front lines of this fight are on social media — Facebook, Twitter, Google, Instagram and others.

2.5 billion people use at least one of Facebook's apps, making it probably the most important social media platform. Unfortunately, its employees, from the CEO on down, don't really believe in free speech. They believe in and actively practice censorship on a scale almost unimaginable a few years ago.

FACEBOOK, OTHER TECH GIANTS SHOULD STOP SUPPRESSING SPEECH

Facebook's embattled founder and CEO Mark Zuckerberg and its Chief Operating Officer Sheryl Sandberg seem determined to make the situation worse. After declaring to Congress their commitment to neutrality they made end-of-year pronouncements that both promised more censorship, and appeased the far left by vowing to involve them with "new products, features and policies."

Facebook is now openly antagonistic toward the right. Posts aren't just blocked by humans who decide what they do or don't like; they are blocked by computer programs designed by humans to ensure liberal sensibilities are not offended. The New York Times says the company is monitoring "billions of posts per day in over 100 languages." That makes what Facebook is doing almost impossible to track, until it's too late.

The Times described a global network with more than 15,000 employees assessing content based on rulebooks more than 1,400 pages long. The rules secretly designate groups as hate organizations and are so specific they even ban certain emoji use. Hate speech mandates alone run "200 jargon-filled, head-spinning pages," wrote The Times.

Facebook is now openly antagonistic toward the right. Posts aren't just blocked by humans who decide what they do or don't like; they are blocked by computer programs designed by humans to ensure liberal sensibilities are not offended.

The result is chaos. There's no consistency in what Facebook bans or doesn't ban — except that conservatives suffer. Pro-life, pro-gun and pro-Trump content all run afoul of Facebook's eager hate speech

ensors, just days before the annual March for Life, Facebook blocked advertising for the new pro-life movie "Roe v. Wade."

Around the Fourth of July, Facebook censored a post for "hate speech." It was the text of the Declaration of Independence.

Conservatives like Samaritan's Pulse head Franklin Graham have been targeted, as well. Graham was suspended recently for a comment he made two years ago. Facebook later apologized.

This is commonplace for conservatives. The company bans, blocks or suspends and then later apologizes ... sometimes.

The radical left has no such worries. Smash Racism DC, the Antifa group that targeted Fox host Tucker Carlson's home and threatened his wife, is still on the site. So is Splinternews, which posted the personal cell phone number of Trump senior adviser Stephen Miller. Even reprehensible anti-Semite Louis Farrakhan has a Facebook page with more than 1.1 million followers.

Facebook is escalating the problem. In November, Zuckerberg announced a new "Blueprint for Content Governance." He wrote like he believes in free speech, saying, "The world is better, ... when traditional gatekeepers like governments and media companies don't control what ideas can be expressed."

But Facebook does.

Two paragraphs later he asked, "What should be the limits to what people can express?" Then he said the site was instituting more content controls that would limit what you see "even if it doesn't actually violate our standards." That's called shadow banning content.

Sandberg followed with an endorsement of the liberal "civil rights audit" of Facebook that included an ACLU executive and 90 left-wing groups. She called it one of her "top priorities for 2019." That audit revealed Facebook had worked so closely with the left that it allowed "several civil rights organizations engaged in the civil rights audit to visit [the company's] election war room."

The report Sandberg endorsed commits Facebook to work with these left-wing groups on "content moderation," elections, and the Orwellian-sounding idea of creating a "civil rights accountability infrastructure."

It also expressed the need for "greater employee diversity." When liberals say "diversity," they mean hiring more liberals from approved special interest groups.

Facebook also engaged the law firm Covington & Burling under former Republican Sen. Jon Kyl of Arizona to audit how Facebook treats conservatives. In theory, that report will get equal attention. But in practice, it won't. It will detail the complaints conservatives have, and Facebook will throw it away. How can it do otherwise? Sandberg has publicly committed to supporting radical left-wing groups — against conservatives.

The company has committed a great deal to the left, including "addressing censorship and harmful and potentially discriminating content on the platform." That is a direct threat against the conservative movement.

These decisions don't feel outrageous, because Facebook sells them under the veneer of neutrality. Articles with a longer read time aren't shown because Facebook made an editorial decision that you shouldn't read short pieces; instead it's because "the time people choose to spend reading or watching content they clicked on from news feed is an important signal that the story was interesting to them". And so Facebook promotes stories with a high read time, because it wants the news feed to be full of "interesting" stories.

You could, of course, argue that the decision to focus on interesting stories, as opposed to important, or pleasing, or humorous ones is itself an editorial decision.

But that argument probably wouldn't be very interesting. So no one would read it, because it wouldn't show up on Facebook. Oh well.

Carlson Blasts YouTube Over Censorship of Coronavirus Video



[Leah Barkoukis](#) @LeahBarkoukis

Posted: Apr 30, 2020 7:30 AM

<https://townhall.com/topics/leahbarkoukis/2020/04/30/carlson-blasts-youtube-over-censorship-of-coronavirus-video-n2567846>



Source: AP Photo/Reed Saxon, File

There is disagreement in the medical community over how much longer many parts of the country should be under strict lockdown orders. In California, two Bakersfield-area doctors are pushing for Gov. Gavin Newsom to lift the order.

Their recommendation came after looking at the statistics from their urgent care facility, which they said showed coronavirus was similar to the flu. Other doctors in the state disagreed.

The video, which featured Dr. Daniel Erickson, was viewed millions of times but then was removed for violating YouTube's terms, which Fox News's Tucker Carlson found to be the most troubling aspect of the story.

If there is one thing Americans need more of right now, it's informed debate, he argued, and that's exactly what authorities don't want.

Carlson's remarks came after YouTube removed a highly circulated video featuring Dr. Daniel Erickson of Bakersfield, Calif. In the video, Erickson alleged that doctors were encouraged to link deaths to COVID-19 to amplify concerns about the pandemic. ([FoxNews.com](#))

"Viewers of Erickson's video were shocked and transfixed by this. They forwarded the videos to friends, who forwarded it on to their friends and suddenly millions of people who spent the last six weeks on a diet of 'Tiger King' and internet memes were watching sober-minded medical researchers reading from charts of statistics," Carlson said.

"Last night the doctor's video was pulled off of YouTube. It wasn't an accident, YouTube admitted doing it. The company cited a violation of company guidelines and didn't apologize."

"When this is all over, it's likely we'll look back on this moment, what YouTube just did, as a turning point in the way we live in this country, a sharp break with 250 years of law and custom," Carlson said.

He noted that the video was made by a local news station and there was absolutely no reason to remove it other than the fact that it disagreed with those in power.

"It was a form of dissent from orthodoxy. YouTube and its parent company Google have now officially banned dissent," Carlson said.

YouTube's CEO Susan Wojcicki said Sunday that content considered "problematic" and that went against the World Health Organization's recommendations would be removed.

Carlson of course pointed out how absurd it was to follow that standard since the WHO has been wrong about the pandemic from the start, at first reassuring people there was no human-to-human transmission, that travel shouldn't be restrict, then saying face masks don't work.

"Those are lies and they were welcome on Google's platforms. Doctors who were treating patients with the virus, meanwhile, have just been banned," Carlson said. "So no. This is not about science. Censorship never is about science, it's about power. Big technology companies are using this tragedy to increase their power over the population."

Censorship by Google

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Censorship_by_Google

This article's lead section may not adequately summarize its contents. To comply with Wikipedia's [lead section guidelines](#), please consider modifying the lead to [provide an accessible overview](#) of the article's key points in such a way that it can stand on its own as a concise version of the article. *(March 2017)*

Google and its subsidiary companies, such as **YouTube**, have removed or omitted information from its services to comply with its company policies, legal demands, and government [censorship laws](#).^[1] Google's censorship varies between countries and their regulations, and ranges from advertisements to speeches. Over the years, the search engine's censorship policies and targets have also differed, and have been the source of internet censorship debates.^[2]

Numerous governments have asked Google to censor what they publish. In 2012, Google ruled in favor of more than half of the requests they received via court orders and phone calls. This did not include China and Iran who had blocked their site entirely.^[3]

In February 2005, Google stopped showing the advertisements of [Oceanic](#), a non-profit organization protesting against a major cruise ship operation's sewage treatment practices. Google cited its editorial policy at the time, stating "Google does not accept advertising if the ad or site advocates against other individuals, groups, or organizations."^[4] The policy was later changed.^[5]

In April 2008, Google refused to run ads for a UK Christian group opposed to abortion, explaining that "At the time, Google policy does not permit the advertisement of websites that contain 'abortion and religion'".^[6]

In April 2014, though Google accepts ads from the pro-choice abortion lobbying group [NARAL](#), they have removed ads for some anti-abortion [crisis pregnancy centers](#). Google removed the Web search ads after an investigation by NARAL found evidence that the ads violate Google's policy against deceptive advertising: According to NARAL, people using Google to search for "abortion clinics" got ads advertising crisis pregnancy centers that were in fact anti-abortion. Google said in a statement that it had followed normal company procedures in applying its ad policy standards related to ad relevance, clarity, and accuracy in this case.^{[7][8]}

In September 2018, Google has removed from its YouTube website a paid advertisement placed by supporters of Russian opposition urging Russians to participate in a protest set for September 9. Russia's Central Election Commission earlier sent a request to Google to remove the advertisement, saying it violated election laws that call for a "day of silence" on election matters ahead of voting, but the advertisement was blocked even in regions where there is no voting set for September 9 and in regions where authorities have authorized the pension-reform protests.^[9]

Google Maps - See also: [Google Maps](#)

In March 2007, allegedly lower resolution [satellite imagery](#) on [Google Maps](#) showing post-[Hurricane Katrina](#) damage in the US state of [Louisiana](#) was replaced with higher resolution images from before the storm.^[10] Google's official blog of April revealed that the imagery was still available in [KML format](#) on [Google Earth](#) or [Google Maps](#).^{[11][12]}

In March 2008, Google removed Street View and 460 degree images of military bases per [The Pentagon's request](#).^[13]

To protect the privacy and anonymity of individuals, Google selectively blurred photographs containing car license number plates and people's faces in [Google Street View](#). Users may request further blurring of images that feature the user, their family, their car or their home. Users can also request the removal of images that feature what Google term "inappropriate content", which falls under their categories of: Intellectual property violations; sexually explicit content; illegal, dangerous, or violent content; child endangerment; hate speech; harassment and threats; personal or confidential information.^[14] In some countries (e.g. Germany) it modifies images of specific buildings.^[15] In the United States, Google Street View adjusts (or omits) certain images deemed of interest to national security by the federal government.^[16]

Google Search See also: Google Search

In the United States, Google commonly filters search results to comply with Digital Millennium Copyright Act-related legal complaints,^[18] such as in 2002 when Google filtered out websites that provided information critical of Scientology.^[19]

In the United Kingdom, it was reported that Google had 'delisted' Inquisition 21st century, a website which claims to challenge moral authoritarian and sexually absolutist ideas in the United Kingdom. Google later released a press statement suggesting Inquisition 21 had attempted to manipulate search results.^[20] In Germany and France, a study reported that approximately 115 white nationalist, Nazi, anti-semitic, Islamic extremist and other websites had been removed from the German and French versions of Google.^[21] Google has complied with these laws by not including sites containing such material in its search results. However, Google does list the number of excluded results at the bottom of the search result page and links to Lumen (formerly Chilling Effects) for explanation.^[22]

Lolicon content

As of April 18, 2010, Google censors the term "lolicon" on its search results, stopping users from finding meaningful results regarding lolicon material, even if the user types words along with the term which would typically lead to explicit content results; the terms "loli" and "lolita" also suffer from censorship when it is attempted to find meaningful results on the subject.^[23]

Removal of SafeSearch options Main article: SafeSearch

As of December 12, 2012, in the U.S., U.K., Australia and some other countries, Google removed the option to turn off the SafeSearch image filter entirely, forcing users to enter more specific search queries to get adult content. Prior to the change three SafeSearch settings—"on", "moderate" and "off"—were available to users. Following the change, two "Filter explicit results" settings—"on" and "off"—were newly established. The former and new "on" settings are similar, and exclude explicit images from search results. The new "off" setting still permits explicit images to appear in search results, but users need to enter more specific search requests, and no direct equivalent of the old "off" setting exists following the change because adding additional explicit search terms alters the search results. The change brings image search results in-line with Google's existing settings for web and video search.^{[24][25]}

Some users have stated that the lack of a completely unfiltered option amounts to "censorship" by Google. A Google spokesperson disagreed, saying that Google is "not censoring any adult content," but "want to show users exactly what they are looking for—but we aim not to show sexually-explicit results unless a user is specifically searching for them."^[26]

Online pharmacies

Following a settlement with the United States Food and Drug Administration ending Google Adwords advertising of Canadian pharmacies that permitted Americans access to cheaper prescriptions, Google agreed to several compliance and reporting measures to limit visibility of "rogue pharmacies". Google and other members of the Center for Safe Internet Pharmacies are collaborating to remove illegal pharmacies from search results, and participating in "Operation Pingen" with the FDA and Interpol.^{[27][28]}

Search suggestions See also: Search suggest drop-down list and Criticism of Google & Web search

In January 2010, Google was reported to have stopped providing automatic suggestions for any search beginning with the term "Islam is", while it continued to do so for other major religions. According to Wired.com, a Google spokesperson said, "this is a bug and we're working to fix it as quickly as we can."^[29] Suggestions for "Islam is" were available later that month. The word "Bilderberg" and the family name "Buchanan" were also reportedly censored in the auto-complete results,^[30] but were available by February 2010 as well. Nonetheless, Google continues to filter certain words from autocomplete suggestions,^[31] describing them as "potentially inappropriate."^[32]

The publication *2009: The Hacker Quarterly* has compiled a list of words that are restricted by Google Instant.¹³¹ These are terms that the company's Instant Search feature will not search.^{132,133} Most terms are often vulgar and derogatory in nature, but some apparently irrelevant searches including "MyLeak" are removed.¹³⁴

As of January 26, 2011, Google's Auto Complete feature would not complete certain words such as "hitotrent", "torrent", "harvent", "megupload", and "rapidshare", and Google actively sensors search terms or phrases that its algorithm considers as likely constituting spam or intending to manipulate search results.¹³⁵

In September 2012, multiple sources reported that Google had removed biexual from the list of blacklisted terms for Instant Search.¹³⁶

Un-googleable

In 2013, the Swedish Language Council included the Swedish version of the word *ungöglig* (*un-googlebar*) [ɛɳ] in its list of new words.¹³⁷ It had "defined the term as something that cannot be found with any search engine".¹³⁸ Google objected to its definition, wanting it to only refer to Google searches, and the Council removed it in order to avoid a legal confrontation.¹³⁹ They also accused Google of trying to "control the Swedish language".¹⁴⁰

Leaked celebrity content

Main article: iCloud celebrity-photo leaks

On August 31, 2014, almost 200 private pictures of various celebrities, containing nudity and explicit content, were made public on certain websites. Google was criticized for linking to such content after some of them became popular enough to reach the front page of some search results.¹⁴¹ Shortly after, Google removed most search results that linked users directly to such content from the incident.¹⁴²

National

Australia

In January 2010, Google Australia removed links to satirical website Encyclopædia Dmmatica's "Aboriginal" article citing it as a violation of Australia's Racial Discrimination Act.¹⁴³ After the website's domain change in 2011, the article resurfaced in Google Australia's search results.

Canada

On 19 June 2014, it was reported that Google had been ordered to remove search results that linked to websites of a company called Dataink by the Supreme Court of British Columbia. The websites in question sell network device technology that Dataink is alleged to have stolen from Quartek Solutions. Google voluntarily removed links from google.ca, the main site used by Canadians, but the court granted a temporary injunction applying to all Google sites across the world.¹⁴⁴ Google argued that Canadian law could not be imposed across the world but was given until 27 June 2014 to comply with the court's ruling.¹⁴⁵

China Main article: Google China

Google adhered to the internet censorship policies of China¹⁴⁷ enforced by means of filters colloquially known as "The Great Firewall of China" until March 2010. Google.cn search results were filtered so as not to bring up any results perceived to be harmful to the People's Republic of China (PRC).¹⁴⁸ Google claimed that some censorship is necessary in order to keep the Chinese government from blocking Google entirely, as occurred in 2002.¹⁴⁹

Google claimed it did not plan to give the government information about users who search for blocked content, and will inform users that content has been restricted if they attempt to search for it.¹⁵⁰ As of 2009, Google was the only major China-based search engine to explicitly inform the user when search results are blocked or hidden. As of December 2012, Google no longer informs the user of possible censorship for certain queries during search.¹⁵¹ The Chinese government has

restricted citizens' access to popular search engines such as Alibaba, Yahoo!, and Google in the past. This complete ban has since been lifted.¹²⁰ However, the government remains active in filtering Internet content. In October 2005, Blogster and access to the Google Cache were made available in mainland China; however, in December 2005 some mainland Chinese users of Blogster reported that their access to the site was once again restricted.¹²¹

In January 2006, Google agreed that the China's version of Google, Google.cn, would filter certain keywords given to it by the Chinese government.¹²² Google pledged to tell users when search results are censored and said that it would not "maintain any services that involve personal or confidential data, such as Gmail or Blogster, on the mainland."¹²³ Google said that it does not plan to give the government information about users who search for blocked content and will inform users that content has been restricted if they attempt to search for it. Searchers may encounter a message which states: "In accordance with local laws and policies, some of the results have not been displayed."¹²⁴ Google issued a statement saying that "removing search results is inconsistent with Google's mission" but that the alternative — being shut down entirely and thereby "providing no information for a heavily degraded user experience that amounts to no information" is more inconsistent with our mission.¹²⁵ Initially, both the censored Google.cn and the uncensored Chinese-language Google.com.cn were available. In June 2006, however, China blocked Google.com.cn once more.¹²⁶

Some Chinese Internet users were critical of Google for assisting the Chinese government in repressing its own citizens, particularly those dissenting against the government and advocating for human rights.¹²⁷ Furthermore, Google had been denounced and called hypocritical by Free Media Movement and Reporters Without Borders for agreeing to China's demands while simultaneously fighting the United States government's requests for similar information.¹²⁸ Google China had also been condemned by Reporters Without Borders,¹²⁹ Human Rights Watch,¹³⁰ and Amnesty International.¹³¹

On February 14, 2006, protesters organized in a "mass hijack with Google" whereby users agreed to boycott Google on Valentine's Day to show their disapproval of the Google China policy.¹³²

In June 2006, Google was ordered by the Chinese government to block various overseas websites, including some with sexually explicit content. Google was criticized by the China Illegal Information Reporting Center (CIIIRC) for allowing search results that included content that was sexual in nature, claiming the company was a dissemination channel for a "huge amount of porn and lewd content."¹³³

On January 12, 2010, in response to an apparent hacking of Google's servers in an attempt to access information about Chinese dissidents, Google announced that "we are no longer willing to continue censoring our results on Google.cn and so over the next few weeks we will be discussing with the Chinese government the basis on which we could operate an unfiltered search engine within the law, if at all."¹³⁴

On March 22, 2010, after talks with Chinese authorities failed to reach an agreement, the company reloaded its censor-complying Google China service to its Google Hong Kong service, which is outside the jurisdiction of Chinese censorship laws. However, at least as of March 23, 2010, "The Great Firewall" continues to censor search results from the Hong Kong portal, www.google.com.hk (as it does with the US portal, www.google.com) for controversial terms such as "Fallen gate" and "the June 4th incident" (Tiananmen Square incident).¹³⁵

In the August 2010, it was revealed that Google was working on a version of its search engine for use in China, which would censor content according to the restrictions placed by the Chinese government. This project was working on by a small percentage of the company, and was codenamed Dragonfly. A number of Google employees expressed their concern about the project and several resigned.¹³⁶

European Union

In July 2014 Google began removing certain search results from its search engine in the European Union in response to requests under the right to be forgotten. Articles whose links were removed, when searching for specific personal names, included a 2007 blog by the BBC journalist Robert Peston about Stan O'Neil, a former chairman of investment bank MetLife Lynch, being forced out after the bank made huge losses.¹³⁷ Peston criticised Google for "...cast[ing him] into oblivion."¹³⁸

The Guardian reported that six of its articles, including three relating to a former Scottish football referee, had been "hidden."¹³⁹ Other articles, including one about French office workers using post-it notes and another about a collapsed fraud trial of a solicitor standing for election to the Law Society's ruling body, were affected.¹⁴⁰

news item reported that a story about Kelly Osborne falling ill on the set of Fashion Police in 2013 had been removed.¹²¹²

The Oxford Mail reported that its publishers had been notified by Google about the removal of links to the story of a conviction for shoplifting in 2006. The paper said it was not known who had asked Google to remove the search result, but there had been a previous complaint to the Press Complaints Commission (PCC) in 2010, concerning accuracy and claiming that the report was causing "embarrassment", requesting the story to be taken off the paper's website. The paper said two factual amendments were made to the article and the PCC dismissed the complaint.¹²¹³

An article about the conversion to Islam of the brother of George Osborne, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, was removed after a request to Google from an unknown person under the right-to-be-forgotten ruling.¹²¹⁴

The Telegraph reported that links to a report on its website about claims that a former Law Society chief faked convictions against his deputy were hidden.¹²¹⁵ The search results for the articles for the same story in the Guardian and the Independent were also removed.¹²¹⁶ The Independent reported that its article, together with an article on the Indian Ocean tsunami in 2004 and one on new trends in sofa design in 1998, had been removed.¹²¹⁷ The Telegraph also reported that links to articles concerning a student's 2008 drink-driving conviction and a 2001 case that resulted in two brothers each receiving nine-month jail terms for affray had been removed.¹²¹⁸

The Spanish newspaper El Mundo reported that some results were hidden over a 2008 news report¹²¹⁹ of a Spanish Supreme Court ruling involving executives of Riviera Coast Invest who were involved in a mortgage mis-selling scandal.¹²²⁰

On 5 July 2014, German news magazine Der Spiegel reported removal of a search result to an article about Scientology.¹²²¹

On 18 August 2014, the BBC reported that Google had removed 42 links to stories on BBC News.¹²²²

Germany and France

On October 22, 2002, a study reported that approximately 713 Internet sites had been removed from the German and French versions of Google.¹²²³ This censorship mainly affected White Nationalist, Nazi, anti-semitic, Islamic extremist websites and at least one fundamentalist Christian¹²²⁴ website. Under French and German law, hate speech and Holocaust denial are illegal. In the case of Germany, violent or sex-related sites such as YouPorn and BMR that the Bundesprüfstelle für jugendgefährdende Medien deems harmful to youth are also censored.

Google has complied with these laws by not including sites containing such material in its search results. However, Google does list the number of excluded results at the bottom of the search result page and links to Lumen (formerly known as Chilling Effects) for explanation.¹²²⁵

Sweden

In March 2018, Google delisted a Wordpress hosted site from search results in Sweden,¹²²⁶ following an intense media frenzy targeted against Google, YouTube and Facebook by the tabloid Expressen and the daily newspaper Dagens Nyheter.¹²²⁷ The Wordpress site lists Swedish Jews in the public sphere, and also agitates against the dominant publishing house Bonnier Group and its left power.¹²²⁸ Bonnier Group is the owner of both newspapers.

Although perfectly legal in Sweden, the Wordpress site was described as anti-semitic.¹²²⁹ The Bonnier papers argued that Google should not promote such content and above all not at a high rank. Ministers in the Swedish green-left government agreed with this sentiment and threatened with national and EU regulation unless Google adapt its algorithms and delist contents of "threats and hate" (*Hot och hat*).¹²³⁰ Google eventually delisted the site in Sweden due to copyright claims.

Said papers also targeted the YouTube channel Granskning Sverige (Scrutiny Sweden) for its alleged extreme right-wing content.¹²³¹ The channel was described as a "mill factory", where members called authorities, journalists and other public figures, and read the recorded interviews to make them fit the channel's right wing extremist world view.¹²³² The interviews were broadcast against a black backdrop with the channel logo type, and the occasional use of screen dumps from

newspaper articles related to the interviews.¹⁰⁰ Google eventually complied with the demands, and closed the case, citing copyright infringement and violation of terms of agreement.¹⁰¹

In April 13, 2018, Google took part in a meeting with the Swedish government, to discuss the search company's role in the media landscape.¹⁰² Minister of Justice, Morgan Johansson (Social Democrats), and Minister of Digitalization, Peter Eriksson (Green Party), expressed concerns that "unlawful" and "harmful" content was facilitated by Google, and that "trolls" could have a negative impact on the upcoming Swedish parliamentary election. Google agreed to refine its algorithms and also hire more staff to make sure "threats and hate" (*hot och hat*) are eliminated from Google search and YouTube videos.¹⁰³ Critics have voiced concerns that private international companies are mandated to pre-consideration into effect to comply with local regulations without guidance from courts, and that free speech is deteriorating at an accelerating rate.¹⁰⁴

India

In September 2016, the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare revealed that Google had agreed to censor search results and advertising of premarital sex disorientation, which is illegal in India.¹⁰⁵

Israel

Since 2015, Google removed certain search results from its search engine in Israel, following gag orders.¹⁰⁶

United Kingdom

On 21 September 2006,¹⁰⁷ it was reported that Google has "delisted" Inquisition 21st Century, a website which claims to challenge moral authoritarian and sexually absolutist ideas in the United Kingdom. According to Inquisition 21, Google was acting "in support of a campaign by law enforcement agencies in the US and UK to suppress emerging information about their involvement in major malpractices", allegedly exposed by their own investigation of and legal action against those who carried out Operation Ore, a far reaching and much criticized law enforcement campaign against the viewers of child pornography.¹⁰⁸ Google released a press statement suggesting Inquisition 21 had attempted to manipulate search results.¹⁰⁹

United States

Google commonly removes search results to comply with Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA)-related legal complaints.¹¹⁰

In 2002, "in an apparent response to criticism of its handling of a threatening letter from a Church of Scientology lawyer," Google began to make DMCA "takedown" letters public, posting such notices on the Chilling Effects archive (now Lumen), which archives legal threats made against Internet users and Internet sites.¹¹¹

In mid-2016, Google conducted a two-month standoff with writer Dennis Cooper after deleting his Blogger and Gmail accounts without warning or explanation following a single anonymous complaint. The case drew worldwide media attention, and finally resulted in Google returning Cooper's content to him.¹¹²

In mid-2018, Google permanently barred conspiracy theorist Alex Jones from using its subsidiary company, YouTube. Jones' channel Infowars responded by "accusing the companies of censorship."¹¹³

In mid-2019, Google allegedly suspended Tulsi Gabbard's advertisements for her presidential campaign, while the candidate was at the height of public interest.¹¹⁴ Gabbard sued Google for \$50 million in damages.¹¹⁵

International

See also: Comparison of web search engines

In June 2017 the Canadian supreme court ruled that Google can be forced to remove search results worldwide. Civil liberties groups including Human Rights Watch, the BC Civil Liberties Association, and the Electronic Frontier Foundation argue that this would set a precedent for Internet censorship. In an appeal Google argued that the global reach of the order was unnecessary and that it raised concerns over freedom of expression. While the court writes that "we have not, in date, accepted that freedom of expression requires the facilitation of the unlawful sale of goods" OpenMedia spokesman David Christopher warns that "there is great risk that governments and commercial entities will see this ruling as justifying censorship requests that could result in perfectly legal and legitimate content disappearing off the web because of a court order in the opposite corner of the globe".¹¹¹¹

YouTube See also: Criticism of Google & YouTube

YouTube, a video sharing website and subsidiary of Google, in its Terms of Service prohibits the posting of videos which violate copyrights or depict pornography, illegal acts, gratuitous violence, hate speech, scientific information about COVID-19.¹¹¹² User-posted videos that violate such terms may be removed and replaced with a message that reads, "This video has been removed due to a violation of our Terms of Service."

In September 2007, YouTube blocked the account of Wael Abbas, an Egyptian activist who posted videos of police brutality, voting irregularities and anti-government demonstrations under the Mubarak regime.¹¹¹³ Shortly afterward, his account was subsequently restored,¹¹¹⁴ and later also 187 of his videos.¹¹¹⁵

In 2006, Thailand blocked access to YouTube after identifying 20 offensive videos it ordered the site to remove.¹¹¹⁶ In 2007, a Turkish judge ordered YouTube to be blocked in his country due to videos insulting Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the founder of the Republic of Turkey (which falls under Article 301 prohibitions on insulting the Turkish nation).¹¹¹⁷ In February 2008, the Pakistani Telecommunications Authority banned YouTube in the country, but the manner in which it performed the block accidentally prevented access to the website worldwide for several hours.¹¹¹⁸ The ban was lifted after YouTube removed controversial religious comments made by a Dutch government official concerning Islam.¹¹¹⁹

In October 2008, YouTube removed a video by Pat Coudell titled Welcome in Saudi Britain; in response, his fans re-uploaded the video themselves and the National Secular Society wrote to YouTube in protest.¹¹²⁰

In 2016, YouTube launched a localized Pakistani version of its website for the users in Pakistan in order to censor content considered blasphemous by the Pakistani government as a part of its deal with the latter. As a result, the three-year ban on YouTube by the Pakistani government was subsequently lifted.¹¹²¹

Advertiser-friendly content

YouTube policies restrict certain forms of content from being included in videos being monetized with advertising, including strong violence, language, sexual content, and "controversial or sensitive subjects and events, including subjects related to war, political conflicts, natural disasters and tragedies, even if graphic imagery is not shown", unless the content is "usually newsworthy or comedic and the creator's intent is to inform or entertain".¹¹²²

In August 2016, YouTube introduced a new system to notify users of violations of the "advertiser-friendly content" rules, and allow them to appeal. Following its introduction, many prominent YouTube users began to accuse the site of engaging in *de facto* censorship, arbitrarily disabling monetization on videos discussing various topics such as skin care, politics, and LGBT history. Philip DeFranco argued that not being able to earn money from a video was "censorship by a different name", while Vlogbrothers similarly pointed out that YouTube had flagged both "Zastari thoughts from a refugee camp" and "Vegetables that look like penises" (although the flagging on the former was eventually overturned).¹¹²³ The hashtag "#YouTubeIsOverParty" was prominently used on Twitter as a means of discussing the controversy. A YouTube spokesperson said that "while our policy of demonetizing videos due to advertiser-friendly concerns hasn't changed, we've recently improved the notification and appeal process to ensure better communication to our creators."¹¹²⁴

In March 2017, a number of major advertisers and prominent companies began to pull their advertising campaigns from YouTube over concerns that their ads were appearing on objectionable and/or extremist content, in what the YouTube community began referring to as a boycott.¹¹²⁵ YouTube personality PewDiePie described these boycotts as an "adapocalypse", noting that his video revenue had fallen to the point that he was generating more revenue from YouTube

Red subscription profit sharing (which is divided based on views by subscribers) than advertising.¹¹²¹ In April 2017, YouTube announced planned changes to its Partner Program, restricting new membership to vetted channels with a total of at least 10,000 video views. YouTube stated that the changes were made in order to "ensure revenue only flows to creators who are playing by the rules."¹¹²²

In July 2017, YouTube began modifying suggested videos to debunk terrorist ideologies.¹¹²³ In August 2017, YouTube wrote a blog post explaining a new "limited state" for religious and controversial videos, which wouldn't allow comments, likes, monetization and suggested videos.¹¹²⁴

In October 2017, *Project* sued YouTube, alleging violations of their freedom of speech under the First Amendment via YouTube's "arbitrary and capricious use of 'restricted mode' and 'demonetization' viewer restriction filters" to suppress their content. A U.S. district appeals court threw out the suit in February 2020, stating that despite "[its] ubiquity and its role as a public-facing platform", YouTube was still considered a private platform (the First Amendment only applies to state actors).¹¹²⁵

In March 2018, *The Atlantic* found that YouTube had de-listed a video where journalist Daniel Lombroso reported a speech by white nationalist Richard B. Spencer at the 2016 annual conference of the National Policy Institute, where they celebrated Donald Trump's win at the presidential election.¹¹²⁶ YouTube re-listed the video after *The Atlantic* sent a complaint.

In June 2019, YouTube updated its hate speech policy to prohibit hateful and supremacist work, to limit the spread of violent extremist content online. This content includes that justify discrimination, segregation or exclusion based on qualities like age, gender, race, caste, religion, sexual orientation or veteran status. For example, videos that include Nazi ideology, Holocaust denial, Sandy Hook conspiracy theories, or flat Earth theories. The policy also aims to reducing borderline content and harmful misinformation, such as videos promising phony miracle cures for serious illness.¹¹²⁷

In February 2020, YouTube reportedly began censoring any content related to the musical coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) by removal or demonetisation citing "sensitive topics" advertiser-friendly content guideline on Twitter.^{1128,1129}

Censorship of sexual content in Restricted Mode

In March 2017, the "Restricted Mode" feature was criticized by YouTube's LGBT community for filtering videos that discuss issues of human sexuality and sexual and gender identity, even when there is no explicit references to sexual intercourse or otherwise inappropriate content.^{1130,1131,1132} Rapper Mykki Blanco told *The Guardian* that such restrictions are used to make LGBT vloggers feel "policed and demeaned" and "sends a clear homophobic message that the fact that my video displays unapologetic queer imagery means it's slapped with an age restriction", while other gig, overly sexualised heteronormative work "remain uncensored."¹¹³³ Musicians Tegan and Sara similarly argued that LGBT people "shouldn't be restricted", after acknowledging that the mode had censored several of their music videos.¹¹³⁴

YouTube later stated that a technical error on Restricted Mode wrongfully impacted "hundreds of thousands" LGBT-related videos.¹¹³⁵

False positives

In February 2019, automated filters accidentally flagged several channels with videos discussing the AR mobile game Pokémon Go and the massively multiplayer online game Club Penguin for containing prohibited sexual content, as some of their videos contained references to "CP" in their title. In Pokémon Go, "CP" is an abbreviation of "Combat Power" — a level system in the game, and "CP" is an abbreviation of Club Penguin, but it was believed that YouTube's filters had accidentally interpreted it as referring to child pornography. The affected channels were restored, and YouTube apologized for the inconvenience.^{1136,1137}

In August 2019, YouTube mistakenly took down robot fighting videos for violating its policies against animal cruelty.¹¹³⁸

In December 2019, YouTube abruptly taken down videos related to cryptocurrency citing them as "harmful or dangerous content" and "sale of regulated goods".^{1139,1140} Days later, videos were restored by YouTube because it was an error.^{1141,1142}

anti-censorship shareholder initiative

On May 10, 2007, shareholders of Google voted down an anti-censorship proposal for the company. The text of the failed proposal submitted by the New York City comptroller's office (which controls a significant number of shares on behalf of retirement funds) stated that:

1. Data that can identify individual users should not be hosted in Internet-restricting countries, where political speech can be treated as a crime by the legal system.
2. The company will not engage in pro-active censorship.
3. The company will use all legal means to resist demands for censorship. The company will only comply with such demands if required to do so through legally binding procedures.
4. Users will be clearly informed when the company has acceded to legally binding government requests to filter or otherwise censor content that the user is trying to access.
5. Users should be informed about the company's data retention practices, and the ways in which their data is shared with third parties.
6. The company will document all cases where legally binding censorship requests have been complied with, and that information will be publicly available.

David Drummond, senior vice president for corporate development, said "Pulling out of China, shutting down Google.cn, is just not the right thing to do at this point... but that's exactly what this proposal would do."¹⁵¹¹

CEO Eric Schmidt and founders Larry Page and Sergey Brin recommended that shareholders vote against the proposal. Together they hold 66.2 percent of Google's total shareholder voting power, meaning that they could themselves have defeated the anti-censorship proposal.¹⁵¹²

Columnist slams YouTube's censorship of viral video: 'These are doctors not activists'

By World Tribune on May 4, 2020

<https://www.worldtribune.com/columnist-slams-youtubes-censorship-of-viral-video-these-are-doctors-not-activists/>

Doctors Dan Erickson and Arin Massih, from Accelerated Urgent Care in Bakersfield, California, posted a video calling the authoritarian ongoing government-imposed lockdowns unconstitutional activities, and said it was time to reopen America. The video received millions of views.

YouTube responded with censorship. The Google-owned video sharing platform removed the doctors' video.



Doctors Dan Erickson, left, and Arin Massih

"The American people are sick and tired of the randomness with which they're being asked to comply with government dictates surrounding COVID-19, and of the ever-changing and outright false numbers on the coronavirus counts coming from hospitals that are then used to justify additional crackdowns on civil liberties." Washington Times columnist Cheryl K. Chumley noted on April 30.

"So they've begun to ask questions, challenge the status quo and even, in some cases, in some states, protest. And that is good."

YouTube's action "doesn't make the doctors' message disappear," Chumley wrote. "It only embeds it further in the minds of the millions who've already heard it. It only raises the red flags that have been raised in recent days over concerns about government's ongoing chipping of citizens' individual rights due to COVID-19 — it only raises these red flags higher."

YouTube explained the censorship this way: "We quickly remove flagged content that violate our Community Guidelines, including content that explicitly disputes the efficacy of local health authority recommended guidance on social distancing that may lead others to act against that guidance."

Chumley wrote: "This whole stifling of opinion and free expression is a dark blot on America. And it comes at a time when dark blots are everywhere. Not only is censorship un-American. Not only is the shutdown of free expression contrary to the First Amendment, and the core American principle of individual rights coming from God, not government."

"But on COVID-19, at this moment in time, at a place in history where Americans are being told to stay home, stay off the streets — except, say, to shop at Walmart or to buy marijuana — and to listen to the government's orders, and oh yes, shhh, to please ignore the fact the orders are based on fault

computer models and false hospital reports. Well, it seems counterintuitive to the cause of calming the citizenry to clamp a couple of doctors' doctorly-based COVID-19 analyses."

Chumley continued: "These are doctors, for crying out loud. Not activists. Aren't Americans being told daily to listen to the medical experts? Now it's only a select group of medical experts Americans are supposed to listen to and obey?"

YouTube "didn't just do a disservice to American freedoms by pulling these doctors' video feeds," Chumley wrote. "YouTube added to the confusion surrounding the coronavirus and to the growing suspicions about politicians' use of the virus for partisan gain — that some would use this crisis to stretch the bounds of government's authority ever more."

Chumley concluded: "The few Americans who weren't concerned about the fate of America's Constitution and freedoms and system of limited government, post-COVID-19, sure as heck are now. Nothing like some good old-fashioned censorship amid a constitutional crisis to raise the red flags on authoritarianism and ratchet fears further. And honestly, Americans are completely justified to worry."

Columnist slams YouTube's censorship of viral video: 'These are doctors not activists'

By World Tribune on May 4, 2020

<https://www.worldtribune.com/columnist-slams-youtubes-censorship-of-viral-video-these-are-doctors-not-activists/>

Doctors Dan Erickson and Artin Massihi, from Accelerated Urgent Care in Bakersfield, California, posted a video calling the authoritarian ongoing government-imposed lockdowns unconstitutional activities, and said it was time to reopen America. The video received millions of views.

YouTube responded with censorship. The Google-owned video sharing platform removed the doctors' video.



Doctors Dan Erickson, left, and Artin Massihi

"The American people are sick and tired of the randomness with which they're being asked to comply with government dictates surrounding COVID-19, and of the ever-changing and outright false numbers on the coronavirus counts coming from hospitals that are then used to justify additional crackdowns on civil liberties." Washington Times columnist Cheryl K. Chumley noted on April 30.

"So they've begun to ask questions, challenge the status quo and even, in some cases, in some states, protest. And that is good."

YouTube's action "doesn't make the doctors' message disappear," Chumley wrote. "It only embeds it further in the minds of the millions who've already heard it. It only raises the red flags that have been raised in recent days over concerns about government's ongoing chipping of citizens' individual rights due to COVID-19 — it only raises these red flags higher."

YouTube explained the censorship this way: "We quickly remove flagged content that violates our Community Guidelines, including content that explicitly disputes the efficacy of local health authority recommended guidance on social distancing that may lead others to act against that guidance."

Chumley wrote: "This whole stifling of opinion and free expression is a dark blot on America. And it comes at a time when dark blot are everywhere. Not only is censorship un-American. Not only is the shutdown of free expression contrary to the First Amendment, and the core American principle of individual rights coming from God, not government.

"But on COVID-19, at this moment in time, at a place in history where Americans are being told to stay home, stay off the streets — except, say, to shop at Walmart or to buy marijuana — and to listen to the government's orders, and oh yes, shhh, to please ignore the fact the orders are based on faulty

computer models and false hospital reports, well, it seems counterintuitive to the citizenry to clamp a couple of doctors' doctorly-based COVID-19 analyses."

Chumley continued: "These are doctors, for crying out loud. Not activists. Aren't Americans being told daily to listen to the medical experts? Now it's only a select group of medical experts Americans are supposed to listen to and obey?"

YouTube "didn't just do a disservice to American freedoms by gulling these doctors' video feeds," Chumley wrote. "YouTube added to the confusion surrounding the coronavirus and to the growing suspicions about politicians' use of the virus for partisan gain — that some would use this crisis to stretch the bounds of government's authority ever more."

Chumley concluded: "The few Americans who weren't concerned about the fate of America's Constitution and freedoms and system of limited government post-COVID-19, sure as heck are now. Nothing like some good old-fashioned censorship amid a constitutional crisis to raise the red flags on authoritarianism and ratchet fears further. And honestly, Americans are completely justified to worry."

YouTube just deleted a wildly popular video featuring a former KGB agent detailing how communists have taken over America's culture and government – but you can still watch it at Brighteon.com

<https://youtube.censorship.com/2019-12-25-youtube-deletes-video-former-kgb-detailing-communists-takeover-america.html>

12/25/2019 / By [Ethan Huff](#)



Rare video footage of a powerful interview with Soviet defector Yuri Bezmenov has been banned by YouTube as part of the Google-owned tech giant's latest censorship efforts against "hate speech."

A former KGB agent, Bezmenov had some not-so-nice things to say about the horrors of communism. He also warned that communism would eventually creep its way into the United States if Americans failed to spot it and deal with it.

This interview with Bezmenov took place back in the 1980s, by the way – and just as he warned it would, we're now seeing communism go mainstream. And ironically enough, one prominent example of its tactics of subversion is the escalating assault on free speech by YouTube and other Big Tech companies.

If Bezmenov were around today – he died back in 1993 – he'd likely be horrified at how quickly communism has basically become the official platform of today's Democrat Party. He'd also probably be shouting from the rooftops that if Americans don't reign in Big Tech and put an end to all of its censorship, then they might as well kiss the First Amendment goodbye.

We've reported on this Bezmenov interview before because it really is a type of modern-day prophecy regarding the potential future of our country. It wakes people up to the threat of communism and why it must be defeated – information that the fascists over at YouTube apparently don't want people to hear.

Fortunately, we were able to get a hold of this Bezmenov interview footage before YouTube scrubbed it from the internet, and it's now available for public viewing at Brighteon.com, the free speech alternative to YouTube.

See it at this link: <https://www.brighteon.com/adf0e1e4-135f-4e37-a060-8cc7a2d1f5ca>

First they came for conservatives, and I did not speak out – because I was not a conservative

As we're now seeing all across the tech spectrum, the information gatekeepers are desperate to control the narrative, just like communists have always done throughout history. But they can't do this with a free and open internet, which is why they've infiltrated tech corporations like YouTube in order to control the content that's published there.

They say it's to fight "hate speech," of course, but we know that there's actually no such thing.

"free speech" is little more than a code phrase used to disguise the online censorship agenda of Silicon Valley, which right this moment is constructing a new internet 2.0 that, just like what currently exists in communist China, is 100 percent censored and controlled by a select few at the top of the totalitarian pole.

We continue to warn our readers, regardless of where they fall on the political spectrum, that censorship is *never* a good thing, regardless of who's being censored. Even if you don't like what someone else has to say, telling him that he *can't* say it crosses a hard line that our founders put in place for a reason – because eventually that censorship will apply to *everyone*.

One of the key tenets of nearly every communist takeover throughout history involved stripping the citizenry of their free speech rights. Budding dictators also used many of the same excuses as today's tech giants in order to do it, such as claiming that they were fighting "hate" from society's "troublemakers."

It's the type of thing that Bezmenov lied when he defected from the KGB and set out to warn others about what he witnessed while a member of the former Soviet Union's "deep state." But people didn't listen to him, or at least not enough of them, because look where we are today.

If YouTube really stood for freedom and liberty, it would be *promoting* videos like the Bezmenov interview, not suppressing and deleting them. And to the leftists who think they're immune to this Big Tech censorship, be warned: *your content is next*.

To keep up with the latest censorship stories, be sure to check out [Censorshipnews](#).

Sources for this article include:

[InformationLiberation.com](#)

[NaturalNews.com](#)

[Brighteon.com](#)

[NaturalNews.com](#)

Angry about Facebook censorship? Wait until you hear about the news feed

Alex Hern (@alexhern)

<https://www.businessinsider.com/tech/2017/05/11/facebook-censorship-news-feed-trending-topics/>

Peeved about Facebook's curation of trending topics? Its news feed is reinventing censorship for a technological age, and humans need not apply



Wed 11 May 2016 10:37 EDT Last modified on Wed 31 May 2017 12:03 EDT



Don't look here. Photograph: Tracy Nearmy/AAP

Bad news: Facebook is censoring the internet every day, warping your understanding of the world around you to benefit its corporate interests, and fundamentally changing the media landscape in a potentially apocalyptic fashion.

Good news: that has little to nothing to do with the fact that the human curators of its trending topics feature are a bit sniffy about linking to Breitbart News.

The most surprising thing about Facebook's trending stories isn't that the human editors behind them occasionally exercise their own judgement in which stories they do or don't link to; it's that even with humans working directly on the feature, it's still awful. The output of the feature is so bad that I and many others assumed it must be entirely algorithmic: how else would you end up with bizarre, gnomish statements like this, taken verbatim from the "science and technology" section of my feed today:

Facebook is a hotbed of censorship. Just try to post a picture of Aboriginal women in traditional dress:

"Quebec, Canada: Parts of Province Experience Snowfall, Report Says"

But no, Facebook has an entire team of writers working on these statements, according to a report from Gizmodo, and those writers are apparently encouraged to focus on mainstream news sites such as the BBC and CNN over fringe right-wing outlets like Breitbart or Newsmax.

Facebook, for its part, denies censoring trending topics, saying that it wouldn't even be "technically feasible" to do what the whistleblower alleged. That hasn't stopped outrage at the report reaching the highest levels: Republican Senator John Thune spoke out on Tuesday, asking the site to explain itself.

If Thune is outraged about stories not appearing on trending topics – a small sidebar which has an unclear influence on web traffic, fails to shape discussion, and is buried on mobile devices – wait until he finds out about the news feed.

newsworthy in Facebook's crown is a hothead of censorship. Don't believe me? Try to post a picture of (non-original women in traditional dress—that is, topless) on your Facebook feed and see how long it lasts.

The company's moderation team is notorious for its heavy-handed approach to topics like nudity, even as it also gets slated by governments worldwide for not removing and reporting content glorifying terrorism rapidly enough.

But being a community moderator at Facebook is a thankless task. The work, often outsourced to companies like Manila-based contractor TaskUs, is performed with little remuneration or training. And even the best-paid highly skilled employees would have trouble drawing a consistent plan of action out of Facebook's vague attempts at drawing up community standards.



Facebook Twitter Pinterest

Facebook's news feed was born in 2006, when the social network was growing into a global phenomenon. Photograph: Justin Sullivan/Getty Images

Say what you like about moderation, though; at least you can see it happening. What seems so disturbing about the alteration of trending topics is that the sites which were kept off the list had no

way of knowing that they had even had a chance. There's no reports feeding back why a curator decided to place or leave a story. It's an opaque system.

Except, of course, that we can speak to former curators of trending topics to find out what they did and didn't post.

With the news feed, there's no such luck. The algorithm that drives it makes just as many editorial choices as the trending topic curators, but you can't interview it to ask why. It will never be fired and decide to speak out about its decisions under the cloak of anonymity. Instead, it just sits there, day in day out, totally dictating the content seen by more than a billion users of the biggest social network in the world.

These decisions don't feel outrageous, because Facebook sells them under the veneer of neutrality.

Perhaps because of that, the majority of Facebook users don't even realise that the news feed is edited at all. A 2015 study suggested that more than 60% of Facebook users are entirely unaware of any algorithmic curation on Facebook at all: "They believed every single story from their friends and followed pages appeared in their news feed", the authors wrote.

The news feed algorithm takes in so many signals when deciding what should be promoted and what should be buried that it's likely the case that there is no one person at Facebook who can list them all. But we know some choices the algorithm makes: it promotes live video as much as possible, and pre-recorded video almost as heavily — although in both cases, only if the video is delivered through Facebook's own platform.

It pushes articles that you spend a long time reading, as well as links posted by your closest friends, over the alternative. If you run a business page on the site, it will show your posts to a tiny fraction of people who've subscribed, and then ask for cash to show it to anyone else.

These decisions don't feel outrageous, because Facebook sells them under the veneer of neutrality. Articles with a longer read time aren't shown because Facebook made an editorial decision that you shouldn't read short pieces: instead it's because "the time people choose to spend reading or watching content they clicked on from news feed is an important signal that the story was interesting to them". And so Facebook promotes stories with a high read time, because it wants the news feed to be full of "interesting" stories.

You could, of course, argue that the decision to focus on interesting stories, as opposed to important, or pleasing, or humorous ones is itself an editorial decision.

But that argument probably wouldn't be very interesting. So no one would read it, because it wouldn't show up on Facebook. Oh well.

Community Standards

<https://www.facebook.com/communitystandards/>

COVID-19: Community Standards Updates and Protections

As people around the world confront this unprecedented public health emergency, we want to make sure that our Community Standards protect people from harmful content and new types of abuse related to COVID-19. We're working to remove content that has the potential to contribute to real-world harm, including through our policies prohibiting coordination of harm, sale of medical masks and related goods, hate speech, bullying and harassment and misinformation that contributes to the risk of imminent violence or physical harm.

As the situation evolves, we continue to look at content on the platform, assess speech trends, and engage with experts, and will provide additional policy guidance when appropriate to keep the members of our community safe during this crisis.

INTRODUCTION: Every day, people use Facebook to share their experiences, connect with friends and family, and build communities. We are a service for more than two billion people to freely express themselves across countries and cultures and in dozens of languages.

We recognize how important it is for Facebook to be a place where people feel empowered to communicate, and we take seriously our role in keeping abuse off our service. That's why we've developed a set of Community Standards that outline what is and is not allowed on Facebook. Our policies are based on feedback from our community and the advice of experts in fields such as technology, public safety and human rights. To ensure that everyone's voice is valued, we take great care to craft policies that are inclusive of different views and beliefs, in particular those of people and communities that might otherwise be overlooked or marginalized.

REITERATING OUR COMMITMENT TO VOICE

The goal of our Community Standards has always been to create a place for expression and give people a voice. This has not and will not change. Building community and bringing the world closer together depends on people's ability to share diverse views, experiences, ideas and information. We want people to be able to talk openly about the issues that matter to them, even if some may disagree or find them objectionable. In some cases, we allow content which would otherwise go against our Community Standards – if it is newsworthy and in the public interest. We do this only after weighing the public interest value against the risk of harm and we look to international human rights standards to make these judgments.

Our commitment to expression is paramount, but we recognize the Internet creates new and increased opportunities for abuse. For these reasons, when we limit expression, we do it in service of one or more the following values:

Authenticity: We want to make sure the content people are seeing on Facebook is authentic. We believe that authenticity creates a better environment for sharing, and that's why we don't want people using Facebook to misrepresent who they are (or what they're doing).

Safety: We are committed to making Facebook a safe place. Expression that threatens people has the potential to intimidate, exclude or silence others and isn't allowed on Facebook.

Privacy: We are committed to protecting personal privacy and information. Privacy gives people the freedom to be themselves, and to choose how and when to share on Facebook and to connect more easily.

Dignity: We believe that all people are equal in dignity and rights. We expect that people will respect the dignity of others and not harass or degrade others.

Our Community Standards apply to everyone, all around the world, and to all types of content. They're designed to be comprehensive – for example, content that might not be considered hateful may still be removed for violating a different policy. We recognize that words mean different things or affect people differently depending on their local community, language, or background. We work hard to account for these nuances while also applying our policies consistently and fairly to people and their expression. In the case of certain policies, we require more information and/or context to enforce in line with our Community Standards.

People can report potentially violating content, including Pages, Groups, Profiles, individual content, and comments. We also give people control over their own experience by allowing them to block, unfollow or hide people and posts.

The consequences for violating our Community Standards vary depending on the severity of the violation and the person's history on the platform. For instance, we may warn someone for a first violation, but if they continue to violate our policies, we may restrict their ability to post on Facebook or disable their profile. We also may notify law enforcement when we believe there is a genuine risk of physical harm or a direct threat to public safety.

Our Community Standards are a guide for what is and isn't allowed on Facebook. It is in this spirit that we ask members of the Facebook community to follow these guidelines.

Please note that the English version of the Community Standards reflects the most up to date set of the policies and should be used as the master document.

Facebook doesn't really believe in free speech. What they believe in (and actively practice) is censorship



By L. Brent Ruess III | Fox News

<https://www.foxnews.com/opinion/facebook-doesnt-really-believe-in-free-speech-what-they-believe-in-and-actively-practice-is-censorship>

Facebook apologizes after temporarily banning Reverend Franklin Graham

Reverend Graham responds. - It's a new year, but Americans are fighting a battle as old as the nation itself. It's the battle to preserve our free speech and for the first time we're losing — badly.

The new front lines of this fight are on social media — Facebook, Twitter, Google, Instagram and others.

2.5 billion people use at least one of Facebook's apps, making it probably the most important social media platform. Unfortunately, its employees, from the CEO on down, don't really believe in free speech. They believe in and actively practice censorship on a scale almost unimaginable a few years ago.

FACEBOOK, OTHER TECH GIANTS SHOULD STOP SUPPRESSING SPEECH

Facebook's embattled founder and CEO Mark Zuckerberg and its Chief Operating Officer Sheryl Sandberg seem determined to make the situation worse. After declaring to Congress their commitment to neutrality, they made end-of-year pronouncements that both promised more censorship, and appeased the far left by vowing to involve them with "new products, features and policies."

Facebook is now openly antagonistic toward the right. Posts aren't just blocked by humans who decide what they do or don't like; they are blocked by computer programs designed by humans to ensure liberal sensibilities are not offended. The New York Times says the company is monitoring "billions of posts per day in over 100 languages." That makes what Facebook is doing almost impossible to track, until it's too late.

The Times described a global network with more than 15,000 employees assessing content based on rulebooks more than 1,400 pages long. The rules secretly designate groups as hate organizations and are so specific they even ban certain emoji use. Hate speech mandates alone run "200 jargon-filled, head-spinning pages," wrote The Times.

Facebook is now openly antagonistic toward the right. Posts aren't just blocked by humans who decide what they do or don't like; they are blocked by computer programs designed by humans to ensure liberal sensibilities are not offended.

The result is chaos. There's no consistency in what Facebook bans or doesn't ban — except that conservatives suffer. Pro-life, pro-gun and pro-Trump content all run afoul of Facebook's eager hate speech

censors. Just days before the annual March for Life, Facebook blocked advertising for the new pro-life movie "Roe v. Wade."

Around the Fourth of July, Facebook censored a post for "hate speech." It was the text of the Declaration of Independence.

Conservatives like Samaritan's Purse head Franklin Graham have been targeted, as well. Graham was suspended recently for a comment he made two years ago. Facebook later apologized.

This is commonplace for conservatives. The company bans, blocks or suspends and then later apologizes ... sometimes.

The radical left has no such worries. Smash Racism DC, the Antifa group that targeted Fox host Tucker Carlson's home and threatened his wife, is still on the site. So is Splinternews, which posted the personal cell phone number of Trump senior adviser Stephen Miller. Even reprehensible anti-Semitic Louis Farrakhan has a Facebook page with more than 1.1 million followers.

Facebook is escalating the problem. In November, Zuckerberg announced a new "Blueprint for Content Governance." He wrote like he believes in free speech, saying "The world is better... when traditional gatekeepers like governments and media companies don't control what ideas can be expressed."

But Facebook does.

Two paragraphs later he asked, "What should be the limits to what people can express?" Then he said the site was instituting more content controls that would limit what you see "even if it doesn't actually violate our standards." That's called shadow banning content.

Sandberg followed with an endorsement of the liberal "civil rights audit" of Facebook that included an ACLU executive and 90 left-wing groups. She called it one of her "top priorities for 2019." That audit revealed Facebook had worked so closely with the left that it allowed "several civil rights organizations engaged in the civil rights audit to visit [the company's] election war room."

The report Sandberg endorsed commits Facebook to work with these left-wing groups on "content moderation," elections, and the Orwellian-sounding idea of creating a "civil rights accountability infrastructure."

It also expressed the need for "greater employee diversity." When liberals say "diversity," they mean hiring more liberals from approved special interest groups.

Facebook also engaged the law firm Covington & Burling under former Republican Sen. Jon Kyl of Arizona to audit how Facebook treats conservatives. In theory, that report will get equal attention. But in practice, it won't. It will detail the complaints conservatives have, and Facebook will throw it away. How can it do otherwise? Sandberg has publicly committed to supporting radical left-wing groups — against conservatives.

The company has committed a great deal to the left, including "addressing censorship and harmful and potentially discriminating content on the platform." That is a direct threat against the conservative movement.

Media Research Center, along with more than 40 other organizations and tens of millions of supporters in our Free Speech Alliance, has called for just the opposite. We put out four demands that should be endorsed by anyone truly committed to having "a platform for all ideas," as Zuckerberg stated: 1. more transparency 2. more clarity on hate speech rules 3. an equal seat at the table for conservatives 4. embracing the First Amendment as a model for allowable speech

Here are the top 10 most outrageous censorship stories of 2019

12/26/2019 / By JD Hayes

<https://youtu.thecensorship.com/2019-12-26-top-10-most-outrageous-censorship-stories-of-2019.html>



The Left-wing establishment media took a big step this year in becoming 'official state-run media,' completely throwing in with the Democrat Party and going all-out to attack and trash President Donald Trump and his supporters.

But when the corporate-run media outlets were defiling Trump's reputation with lies fed to them by the deep state, they were doing their best to propagandize against truth on many levels and with various subjects.

Mostly, that involved censoring facts through acts of omission.

With that, and after careful review, we bring you 10 of the most egregious and outrageous examples of censorship and lying of the past year:

1. Google to begin blocking all anti-cancer, 'anti-vax,' and anti-GMO websites

As exclusively reported by *Natural News*, founder and editor Mike Adams in July, search behemoth Google will begin blocking *all* websites that publish truth about alternative cancer treatments, the dangers behind vaccines, and disturbing health facts related to GMO foods.

Because we can't have free exchanges of ideas and information when such exchanges disrupt the status quo with facts the healthcare industry doesn't want you to know.

2. Google declares supplements and organics to be a 'lie' and a 'scam'

Google struck a blow against health facts and truth again over the summer when it began "censoring all content about organics, homeopathy, naturopathy, chiropractic, herbs, nutrition and supplements," Adams reported, citing an analysis of data from Sanyer Ji, founder of GreenMedInfo.

3. Facebook also pledged to block ALL posts questioning the deadly vaccine industry

At the request of House Intelligence Committee chairman and lead Trump impeachment houseer Adam Schiff (D-Calif.), Facebook announced in February it would soon begin censoring any content that questions the establishment healthcare industry's dogma that 'all vaccines are safe and effective.'

So much for that First Amendment thingy.

4. Amazon prefers satanism over any films that are critical of the vaccine industry

Yes, the e-tailer giant also got into the censorship act this past year when officials declared they banned the sale of anti-vaccine documentaries based on 'sound science and replicable data,' while still allowing people to publish and sell books on "Satanism" — in particular, satanist books that focus on teenagers.

Jeff Bezos... what a guy. It's almost as though he wants to oversee the destruction of truth and the free exchange of ideas while promoting tyranny and authoritarianism. And censorship.

And this guy owns the Washington Post:

5. Twitter blocked Natural News and the Health Ranger

After Adams, the Health Ranger, appeared on the Alex Jones Show to discuss the truth about Twitter founder Jack Dorsey's "criminal fronting for Bitcoin and deep state money laundering," lo and behold he found his channel and those belonging to Natural News blocked, and without explanation.

Dorsey was pushing a Lightning Labs project that was, at the time, working to push a new protocol into Bitcoin, but he didn't discuss it on the air with host Joe Rogan — who never asked the Twitter CEO about that massive conflict of interest.

6. Did the Trump administration send a warning to Big Tech?

In June, Adams reported that shortly after the Trump White House announced a Justice Department anti-trust probe into Google, "dozens of tech companies have been disrupted via sweeping internet outages that many are calling the 'internet kill switch.'"

The reason for the investigation was the continued censorship by the Big Tech giants of conservative, pro-Trump websites and news organizations. Maybe the 'kill switch' was the administration's way of saying, 'Stop messing with us or we'll put you out of business,' Adams intimated.

7. Facebook banned Natural News

Around the same time of the 'kill switch' incident, Facebook permanently banned Natural News from posting any content following "a coordinated, heavily-funded smear campaign against" the news site and its founder, Adams. "This is on top of permanent bans of Natural News content from Twitter, YouTube, Pinterest, Google News, Apple, and other techno-fascists that now represent" a massive threat to human freedom.

8. Apple threatened permanent banning as well

Earlier, in February, Apple demanded that Natural News stop publishing factual news and information pertaining to the abortion industry and Satanism, or the Big Tech giant would block Natural News from all Apple devices.

"With Democrats now openly pushing infanticide and the legalization of the serial killing of infants, tech giants like Apple are serving as the censorship 'speech police' to silence all criticism of the gruesome practice," Adams wrote.

9. Microsoft gets in on the censorship too

In January, Microsoft unveiled plans to partner with NewsGuard, a startup that aims to censor much of what appears on the Internet that does not comport with Left-wing establishment and globalist agendas. Labeling 'dissent' as "fake news," Microsoft's effort is nothing more than blatant censorship.

Shameless Censorship by the BBC and YouTube How Dare They LOCKDOWN Our Minds



Gumshoe News
April 10, 2020
by Dee McLachlan

<https://gumshoenews.com/2020/04/10/shameless-censorship-by-the-bbc-and-youtube-how-dare-they-lockdown-our-minds/>

Cell tower on apartment building in St Kilda, Melbourne

Two days ago I was trawling through interesting videos, I saved the links to about nine YouTube clips. When I returned to the list about 24 hours later, at least four had done a "disappearing act". One had been placed on "private", the others had a "violating policy" message. *Gone with the Wind*.

After Infowars was removed from various platforms, a number of other alternative sites were targeted. They were wiping mostly conservative voices off platforms, and expunging their audiences.

But this week a new censorship war has begun — the eradication of ideas. This is equivalent of book-burning through the ages — when past authorities suppressed dissenting views or beliefs that posed a threat to the prevailing order.

Man has consistently set fire to ideas. There was the burying of scholars in China (210-213 BCE); the Roman emperor Constantine burning books; and in AD 367 Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, destroyed "unacceptable" writings. During the conquest of the Americas, records of knowledge of the Aztecs was destroyed — but the Aztecs had previously destroyed Mayan books and documents. *It's the thing to do, and it's back in fashion.*



Book burning in Berlin, May 1933

Welcome to 2020, it's no longer book-burning, it's now "knowledge-erase". No fire or heat required — just a docile lockdown public, and a neat algorithm. For it seems many have had their brains in "lockdown" for some time now.

Blame It on David Icke

YouTube and the mainstream media found the perfect target: David Icke. A BBC article entitled: "Coronavirus: YouTube tightens rules after David Icke 5G interview" reports:

"YouTube has banned all conspiracy theory videos falsely linking coronavirus symptoms to 5G networks. The Google-owned service will now delete videos violating the policy. It [YouTube] had previously limited itself to reducing the frequency it recommended them in its Up Next section.

"The move follows a live-streamed interview with conspiracy theorist David Icke on Monday, which he had linked the technology to the pandemic. YouTube said the video would be wiped. During the interview, Mr Icke falsely claimed there "is a link between 5G and this health crisis".

They ignore the fact that Icke predicted this 20 years ago.

26,000 Scientists vs "Policy Violation"

The powers that be demand that voices critical of 5G be silenced, because they are *false*. No explanation. Just believe us. But what about the Petition signed by 26,000 Scientists Opposing the 5G Roll Out? I know of another by 5,000 scientists.

In principia-scientific.org Arthur Firstenberg writes:

"Stop The 5G Network On Earth And In Space, Devastating Impacts On Health And The Environment, To the UN, WHO, EU, Council of Europe and governments of all nations

"We the undersigned scientists, doctors, environmental organizations and citizens from () countries, urgently call for a halt to the deployment of the 5G (fifth generation) wireless network, including 5G from space satellites. 5G will massively increase exposure to radio frequency (RF) radiation on top of the 2G, 3G and 4G networks for telecommunications already in place. RF radiation has been proven harmful for humans and the environment. The deployment of 5G constitutes an experiment on humanity and the environment that is defined as a crime under international law."

They continue:

"Despite widespread denial, the evidence that radio frequency (RF) radiation is harmful to life is already overwhelming. The accumulated clinical evidence of sick and injured human beings, experimental evidence of damage to DNA, cells and organ systems in a wide variety of plants and animals, and epidemiological evidence that the major diseases of modern civilization—cancer, heart disease and diabetes—are in large part caused by electromagnetic pollution, forms a literature base of well over 10,000 peer-reviewed studies.

"If the telecommunications industry's plans for 5G come to fruition, no person, no animal, no bird, no insect and no plant on Earth will be able to avoid exposure, 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, to levels of RF radiation that are tens to hundreds of times greater than what exists today, without any possibility of escape anywhere on the planet. These 5G plans threaten to provoke serious, irreversible effects on humans and permanent damage to all of the Earth's ecosystems."

The dollar overrides sanity and health.

Policy Violation

The BBC article continued:

"YouTube only deleted the content after the session had ended, despite being aware of the broadcast while it was ongoing. It changed its rules after the BBC questioned why the video was permitted. [Permitted?]

"We have clear policies that prohibit videos promoting **medically unsubstantiated methods to prevent the coronavirus** in place of seeking medical treatment [*Hang on, much of the advice being deleted is by medical professionals*], and we quickly remove videos violating these policies when flagged to us," a spokeswoman for YouTube told the BBC. "Now any content that disputes the existence or transmission of Covid-19, as described by the WHO [World Health Organization] and local health authorities is in violation of YouTube policies."

"This includes conspiracy theories which claim that the symptoms are caused by 5G."

But the BBC claims that conspiracy theories claiming "5G... helps transmit coronavirus" have been condemned by the scientific community, saying it's "complete rubbish". That makes sense. 5G could *not* "transmit" the virus — but might it affect a person's immune system?

So are 26,000 scientists delusional? At a US Congressional hearing, the tech companies admitted that NO research into health had been done.

Maybe detainment camps awaits those disgruntled with the 5G roll-out.

The New York Times

<https://www.nytimes.com/2019/06/05/business/youtube-remove-extremist-videos.html>

YouTube to Remove Thousands of Videos Pushing Extreme Views



Content "alleging that a group is superior in order to justify discrimination, segregation or exclusion" and videos denying that violent incidents occurred will be removed, YouTube said Wednesday. Credit: Dado Ruvic/Reuters

By [Kevin Roose](#) and [Kate Conger](#)

June 5, 2019

• YouTube announced plans on Wednesday to remove thousands of videos and channels that advocate neo-Nazism, white supremacy and other bigoted ideologies in an attempt to clean up extremism and hate speech on its popular service.

The new policy will ban "videos alleging that a group is superior in order to justify discrimination, segregation or exclusion," the company said in a [blog post](#). The prohibition will also cover videos denying that violent events, like the mass shooting at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Connecticut, took place.

YouTube did not name any specific channels or videos that would be banned. But on Wednesday, numerous far-right creators began [complaining](#) that their videos had been deleted, or had been stripped of ads, presumably a result of the new policy.

"It's our responsibility to protect that, and prevent our platform from being used to incite hatred, harassment, discrimination and violence," the blog post said.

The decision by YouTube, which is owned by Google, is the latest action by a Silicon Valley company to stem the spread of hate speech and disinformation on its site. A month ago, Facebook [evicted seven](#) of its most controversial users, including Alex Jones, the conspiracy theorist and founder of Infowars. Twitter [banned Mr. Jones](#) last year.

The companies have come under intense criticism for their delayed reaction to the spread of hateful and false content. At the same time, [President Trump and others argue](#) that the giant tech platforms censor right-wing opinions, and the new policies put in place by the companies have inflamed those debates.

The tension was evident on Tuesday, when YouTube said a prominent right-wing creator who used racial language and homophobic slurs to harass a journalist in videos on YouTube did not

violate its policies. The decision set off a firestorm online, including accusations that YouTube was giving a free pass to some of its popular creators.

In the videos, that creator, Steven Crowder, a conservative commentator with nearly four million YouTube subscribers, repeatedly insulted Carlos Maza, a journalist from Vox. Mr. Crowder used slurs about Mr. Maza's Cuban-American ethnicity and sexual orientation. Mr. Crowder said his comments were harmless, and YouTube determined that they did not break its rules.

"Opinions can be deeply offensive, but if they don't violate our policies, they'll remain on our site," YouTube said in a statement about its decision on Mr. Crowder.

On Wednesday, YouTube appeared to backtrack, saying that Mr. Crowder had, in fact, violated its rules, and that his ability to earn money from ads on his channel would be suspended as a result.

"We came to this decision because a pattern of egregious actions has harmed the broader community," the company wrote on Twitter.

The whiplash-inducing deliberations illustrated a central theme that has defined the moderation struggles of social media companies: Making rules is often easier than enforcing them.

"This is an important and long-overdue change," Becca Lewis, a research affiliate at the nonprofit organization Data & Society, said about the new policy. "However, YouTube has often executed its community guidelines unevenly, so it remains to be seen how effective these updates will be."

YouTube's scale — more than 500 hours of new videos are uploaded every minute — has made it difficult for the company to track rule violations. And the company's historically lax approach to moderating extreme videos has led to a drumbeat of scandals, including accusations that the site has promoted disturbing videos to children and allowed extremist groups to organize on its platform. YouTube's automated advertising system has paired offensive videos with ads from major corporations, prompting several advertisers to abandon the site.

The kind of content that will be prohibited under YouTube's new hate speech policies includes videos that claim Jews secretly control the world, that say women are intellectually inferior to men and therefore should be denied certain rights, or that suggest that the white race is superior to another race, a YouTube spokesman said.

Channels that post some hateful content, but that do not violate YouTube's rules with the majority of their videos, may receive strikes under YouTube's three-strike enforcement system, but would not be immediately banned.

The company also said channels that "repeatedly brush up against our hate speech policies" but don't violate them outright would be removed from YouTube's advertising program, which allows channel owners to share in the advertising revenue their videos generate.

In addition to tightening its hate speech rules, YouTube announced that it would tweak its recommendation algorithm, the automated software that shows users videos based on their interests and past viewing habits. This algorithm is responsible for more than 70 percent of overall time spent on YouTube, and has been a major engine for the platform's growth. But it has also drawn accusations of leading users down rabbit holes filled with extreme and divisive content, in an attempt to keep them watching and drive up the site's use numbers.

"If the hate and intolerance and supremacy is a match, then YouTube is lighter fluid," said Rashad Robinson, president of the civil rights nonprofit Color of Change. "YouTube and other platforms have been quite slow to address the structure they've created to incentivize hate."

In response to the criticism, YouTube announced in January that it would recommend fewer objectionable videos, such as those with conspiracy theories about the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks and vaccine misinformation, a category it called "borderline content." The YouTube spokesman said on Tuesday that the algorithm changes had resulted in a 50 percent drop in recommendations to such videos in the United States. He declined to share specific data about which videos YouTube considered "borderline."

"Our systems are also getting smarter about what types of videos should get this treatment, and we'll be able to apply it to even more borderline videos moving forward," the company's blog post said.

Other social media companies have faced criticism for allowing white supremacist content. Facebook recently banned a slew of accounts, including that of Paul Joseph Watson, a contributor to Infowars, and Laura Loomer, a far-right activist. Twitter bars violent extremist groups but allows some of their members to maintain personal accounts — for instance, the Ku Klux Klan was barred from Twitter in August, while its former leader David Duke remains on the service.

Twitter is studying whether the removal of content is effective in stemming the tide of radicalization online. A Twitter spokesman declined to comment on the study.

When Twitter barred Mr. Jones, he responded with a series of videos denouncing the platform's decision and drumming up donations from his supporters.

YouTube's ban of white supremacists could prompt a similar cycle of outrage and grievance, said Joan Donovan, the director of the Technology and Social Change Research Project at Harvard. The ban, she said, "presents an opportunity for content creators to get a wave of media attention, so we may see some particularly disingenuous uploads."

"I wonder to what degree will the removed content be amplified on different platforms, and get a second life?" Ms. Donovan added.

A version of this article appears in print on June 6, 2019, Section B, Page 1 of the New York edition with the headline: YouTube Ban Addresses Extremism. [Order Reprints](#) | [Today's Paper](#) | [Subscribe](#)

In today's twisted world, threatening to kill ICE agents is ruled "protected speech" while questioning vaccine safety gets you banned and attacked

12/26/2019 / By [Ethan Huff](#)



A 35-year-old Massachusetts man who, based on his picture, appears to be a little light in the loafers has been acquitted by a jury after offering a \$500 bounty on Twitter to anyone willing to murder an Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) agent.

Brandon Ziobrowski of Cambridge had reportedly posted an announcement on his social media account encouraging his followers to take the life of an ICE agent in exchange for cash – a clear and present threat that a local jury ultimately determined to be "protected speech" under the First Amendment.

Even as social media companies like Facebook aggressively de-platform users for posting truthful information about vaccines that goes against the official government narrative, Ziobrowski was given a free pass to continue running his mouth online – could it be because he's a member of a protected societal class?

We won't speculate any further on that angle, but one thing is for sure: Ziobrowski obviously hates federal law enforcement officials who are tasked with addressing illegal immigration. As a typical American liberal, Ziobrowski presumably believes that "no human is illegal" – except for humans who work at ICE, however, whom he believes should be extinguished.

"It seemed like the right verdict," Ziobrowski is quoted as saying as he walked out of the court room completely vindicated for making these online threats. "It's been a horrible year, I'm glad it's over."

Had Ziobrowski been convicted of using interstate and foreign commerce to transmit a threat, he could have ended up in prison for up to five years, as well as forced to pay a \$250,000 fine. But because it's now "politically correct" to wish for the death of ICE agents, Ziobrowski was set free.

"We respect the jury's verdict. But in this case, the defendant posted a tweet that, on its face, offered \$500 to anyone who killed a federal agent," stated U.S. Attorney Andrew Lelling in a follow-up statement to the decision.

"In 2019, over 100 law enforcement officers died in the line of duty. The public needs to know that, regardless of today's verdict, we will never hesitate to prosecute threats against law enforcement officers."

Keep in mind that Ziobrowski's offending tweet wasn't an isolated incident. The guy has reportedly tweeted and shared all sorts of offensive content on social media that, were Ziobrowski a conservative, would have at the very least warranted him being shadow-banned or removed from social media entirely; if not prosecuted and actually sent to prison for "hate speech."

We don't know about you, but we think offering money in exchange for murder is about as hateful as you can get. And yet it's not the right *kind* of hate as to warrant the same type of punishment that 30-year-old Adolfo Martinez from Ames, Iowa, received after he was convicted of – *gasp!* – stealing an LGBTQ “rainbow” flag from a local “church” and burning it.

Martinez received a whopping 16 years in prison for this “hate crime,” even though nobody and nothing was harmed besides the cheap made-in-China piece of cloth. Meanwhile, Ziobrowski offers to pay off a bounty hunter, essentially, and is let off the hook completely because the leftist jury in his case apparently loves homosexuals and hates ICE – meaning Ziobrowski's hate is the “acceptable” kind.

“What would happen if someone tweeted an offer to have him deleted?” asked one *Fox News* commenter about a scenario in which the tables were turned.

“This is considered free speech? Then what about the Confederate monuments,” asked another.

“To threaten someone is acceptable but to be offended or to be perceived to be called a name is bigoted and hateful? There is no way to logically reason with these people because logic does not exist in their mind.”

Sources for this article include:

[FoxNews.com](https://www.foxnews.com)

[NaturalNews.com](https://www.naturalnews.com)

[NaturalNews.com](https://www.naturalnews.com)

Anyone who contradicts the corrupt, communist-run WHO is now in automatic violation of YouTube's policies

04/09/2020 / By [Ethan Huff](#)

<https://youtube.censorship.com/2020-04-09-anyone-who-contradicts-who-now-violating-youtube-policies.html>



A growing compendium of scientific evidence is linking 5G exposure to increased severity of Wuhan coronavirus (COVID-19) symptoms, though YouTube doesn't want you to know about this.

The Google-owned video platform, which for years has been censoring information that it deems unworthy of consideration, says that any allegation of 5G exacerbating

Wuhan coronavirus (COVID-19) infections is a "conspiracy theory," and in violation of the platform's guidelines.

Even just questioning the official story of the World Health Organization (WHO), YouTube's ministry of propaganda for the Wuhan coronavirus (COVID-19), is no longer in line with YouTube's "community guidelines," which command total obedience to the globalist entity's decrees about the pandemic.

It is also no longer permitted to question or speak against the Wuhan coronavirus (COVID-19) itself, such as asking hypothetically whether it's really as serious as authorities are claiming.

"Now any content that disputes the existence or transmission of COVID-19, as described by the WHO and local health authorities, is in violation of YouTube policies," a company spokesman is quoted as saying in a recent statement.

"This includes conspiracy theories which claim that the symptoms are caused by 5G."

According to YouTube, anything other than what the WHO is saying about the Wuhan coronavirus (COVID-19) is "medically unsubstantiated," and thus not allowed on the YouTube platform because it might interfere with people rushing out to get treatment at the first signs of symptoms.

"We have clear policies that prohibit videos promoting medically unsubstantiated methods to prevent the coronavirus in place of seeking medical treatment, and we quickly remove videos violating these policies when flagged to us," the statement from YouTube goes on to explain.

"For borderline content that could misinform users in harmful ways, we reduce recommendations. We'll continue to evaluate the impact of these videos on communities around the world."

Be sure to listen below to *The Health Ranger Report* as Mike Adams, the Health Ranger, talks about some of the science showing that 5G does, in fact "turbo-charge" the Wuhan coronavirus (COVID-19) and make its symptoms even worse:

Brighteon will NEVER censor video content dealing with the health risks of 5G

YouTube recently pulled a London Real video featuring David Icke, who believes that 5G is part of a much larger globalist plot to take over society and control humanity. Icke discussed how people in Europe are now destroying 5G towers, and that an increasing number of people everywhere are opposed to their installation.

Whether Icke's claims are fully true, partially true, or not true at all is beside the point. What's disturbing is that, once again, YouTube has taken it upon itself to police all content that doesn't regurgitate the official government narrative on any given topic, in this case the Wuhan coronavirus (COVID-19).

Such behavior is precisely why we created the Brighteon.com platform, which exists as a free speech alternative to YouTube. You won't find any censorship of content on there that deals with the very real health risks associated with 5G technology, regardless of its link to the Wuhan coronavirus (COVID-19).

We tend to agree with Icke's overall conclusion that, "If 5G continues and reaches where they want to take it, human life as we know it is over ... so people have to make a decision."

Again, this is true regardless of a potential link to the Wuhan coronavirus (COVID-19) because 5G uses intense, millimeter wave radiation to deliver coverage, and this type of radiation does not mesh well with the human frame, to put it simply.

Why is Twitter Censoring Free Speech?

February 10, 2017 By [Aaron](#)

<https://freedomandfulfillment.com/twitter-censorship-free-speech/>

There has been a disturbing trend of increasing censorship against free speech on Twitter. This comes not from radicals or extremists on the platform but from Twitter itself. Needless to say the increased Twitter censorship is unsettling.

Twitter's new safety policies

On Tuesday Twitter Safety made [an announcement](#) about new policies rolling out in the coming weeks.

"We stand for freedom of expression and people being able to see all sides of any topic. That's put in jeopardy when abuse and harassment stifle and silence those voices. We won't tolerate it and we're launching new efforts to stop it."

This makes no sense, as users on an egalitarian platform don't have the capacity to "stifle and silence" one another. Everyone stands on equal ground. The only actor with the power to silence users is Twitter themselves, and that is, seemingly, exactly what they are doing.

"Today, we're announcing three changes: stopping the creation of new abusive accounts, bringing forward safer search results, and collapsing potentially abusive or low-quality Tweets."

More vaguely and Orwellian doublespeak; People's concern here is that this is not about safety or protecting the integrity of the platform, but rather Twitter pushing its own ideological agenda.

The problem with censorship

The problem with censorship is always the same: **who gets to decide?**

Who gets to decide what is acceptable and what is to be censored? Who gets to decide what constitutes "abuse"? Who gets to decide when a search result is too "unsafe" or "sensitive" for you to see?

Others are calling attention to this issue. Click the tweet below to read the replies of Twitter users themselves.

YouTube CEO: Anything that goes against the WHO is a violation of YouTube policies

<https://reclaimtheeet.org/youtube-ceo-coronavirus-right-information-misinformation/>

- By Tom Parkes
- Posted 10:15 pm

YouTube is also giving legacy media outlets and public health organizations billions of impressions.



In her first interview since the coronavirus lockdown started in the US, YouTube CEO Susan Wojcicki discussed how the platform has responded to the pandemic by removing thousands of videos and sending over 10 billion views to legacy media outlets.

Wojcicki made the comments during an appearance on CNN reporter Brian Stelter's Reliable Sources podcast where she mostly focused on the platform's efforts to give people the "right information" and stamp out "misinformation."

"We also talk about removing information that is problematic," Wojcicki said. "We've had to update our policy numerous times associated with COVID-19."

Wojcicki then went on to give examples of content that would be a violation of YouTube's policies, including anything "that is medically unsubstantiated, so people saying like, 'take vitamin C, take turmeric, like those are or will cure you.' Those are the examples of things that would be a violation of our policy."

When it comes to determining what YouTube classes as "misinformation," Wojcicki said that "anything that would go against World Health Organization [WHO] recommendations would be a violation of our policy" – the same WHO that amplified China's propaganda about there being "no evidence of human-to-human transmission" of the coronavirus and criticized Taiwan after a Chinese propaganda campaign on Twitter.

And when it comes to the sources of "right information," Wojcicki has chosen "authoritative sources" (legacy media outlets) and public health organizations – many of which were downplaying the severity of the coronavirus and telling the public masks are not effective as recently as late March, only to change their rhetoric in April to position the coronavirus as a much more serious threat and recommend wearing masks.



YouTube CEO Susan Wojcicki told CNN's Brian Stelter "anything that would go against World Health Organization recommendations" is a violation of YouTube's policies (CNN – Reliable Sources)

In terms of specific YouTube stats, Wojcicki said that:

- There's been a 75% increase in video views for authoritative sources since the start of 2020
- Public health organizations have had over 10 billion impressions
- The coronavirus news shelf has been viewed over 10 billion times

In addition to boosting views to these pre-selected sources by giving them preferential treatment in YouTube's recommendations, promoting them through banners on the site, and giving them prime positioning on the homepage via the coronavirus news shelf, Wojcicki said YouTube is also trying to "get the right voices out there" by arranging interviews between YouTubers and health experts.

Wojcicki also touched on the controversial changes YouTube has made over the last couple of years which have resulted in many creators being demonetized, having their content removed, or even having their entire channels deleted.

The YouTube CEO framed these changes as "progress" and said they've created an environment where "if you talk to most people," it's "really hard, if not impossible" to find misinformation.

During the second half of the interview, Wojcicki praised YouTube's use of machines to review and take down content and claimed that "they have been able to continue to be really effective during this time" – a reversal of the platform's previous sentiment that relying on automated systems during the pandemic will result in more deleted videos, including those that don't violate community guidelines.

Rand Paul blasts YouTube over censorship of speech on senate floor

03/03/2020 / By News Editors



Senator Rand Paul (R-KY) has called out Google-owned YouTube after it blacklisted a clip of him speaking on the Senate floor, an act of censorship he calls "chilling and disturbing." Google censored Paul because he read out the name of the alleged "whistleblower," Eric Ciaramella.

(Article by Allum Bokhari republished from Breitbart.com)

Politico reported the story as "new," even though Breitbart News first revealed that YouTube was blocking clips of the Senator mentioning Ciaramella's name last week.

In a statement, Sen. Paul said:

It is a chilling and disturbing day in America when giant web companies such as YouTube decide to censor speech. Now, even protected speech, such as that of a senator on the Senate floor, can be blocked from getting to the American people. This is dangerous and politically biased. Nowhere in my speech did I accuse anyone of being a whistleblower, nor do I know the whistleblower's identity.

A spokeswoman for YouTube, Ivy Choi, defended the company's censorship of Sen. Paul in a comment, describing Ciaramella as the whistleblower.

Videos, comments, and other forms of content that mention the leaked whistleblower's name violate YouTube's Community Guidelines and will be removed from YouTube. We've removed hundreds of videos and over ten thousand comments that contained the name. Video uploaders have the option to edit their videos to exclude the name and reupload.

As Breitbart News reported last week, Sen. Paul made his comments on the floor of the Senate after Chief Justice John Roberts refused to allow his question to be read during the impeachment trial. In his speech, Sen. Paul said:

Manager Schiff and Counsel for the President, are you aware that house intelligence committee staffer Shawn Misko had a close relationship with Eric Ciaramella when at the National Security council together, and are you aware and how do you respond to reports that Ciaramella and Misko may have worked together to plot impeaching the President before there were formal House proceedings?

Explaining his argument further in a subsequent [CNN segment](#), Sen. Paul said "I think it's very important that we know if there was a concerted government plot to bring the president down by a lot of employees."

Read more at: [Breitbart.com](#) and [Censorship.news](#).

Shameless Censorship by the BBC and YouTube How Dare They LOCKDOWN Our Minds



Gunshoe News
April 10, 2020
by Dee McLaughlan

<https://gunshoeneews.com/2020/04/10/shameless-censorship-by-the-bbc-and-youtube-how-dare-they-lockdown-our-minds/>

Cell tower on apartment building in St Kilda, Melbourne

Two days ago I was trawling through interesting videos. I saved the links to about nine Youtube clips. When I returned to the list about 24 hours later, at least four had done a "disappearing act". One had been placed on "private". The others had a "violating policy" message. *Gone with the Wind*.

After Infowars was removed from various platforms, a number of other alternative sites were targeted. They were wiping mostly conservative voices off platforms, and expunging their audiences.

But this week a new censorship war has begun — the eradication of ideas. This is equivalent of book burning through the ages — when past authorities suppressed dissenting views or beliefs that posed a threat to the prevailing order.

Man has consistently set fire to ideas. There was the burying of scholars in China (210-213 BCE); the Roman emperor Constantine burning books; and in AD 367 Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, destroyed 'unacceptable' writings. During the conquest of the Americas, records of knowledge of the Aztecs was destroyed — but the Aztecs had previously destroyed Mayan books and documents. *It's the thing to do, and it's back in fashion.*



Book burning in Berlin, May 1933

Welcome to 2020. It's no longer book-burning, it's now "knowledge-erase". No fire or heat required — just a double locked-down public, and a neat algorithm. For it seems many have had their brains in "lockdown" for some time now.

Blame It on David Icke

YouTube and the mainstream media found the perfect target: David Icke. A BBC article entitled "Coronavirus: YouTube tightens rules after David Icke 5G interview" reports,

"YouTube has banned all conspiracy theory videos falsely linking coronavirus symptoms to 5G networks. The Google-owned service will now delete videos violating the policy. It [YouTube] had previously limited itself to reducing the frequency it recommended them in its Up Next section.

...move follows a live-streamed interview with conspiracy theorist David Icke on Monday, in which he had linked the technology to the pandemic. YouTube said the video would be wiped. During the interview, Mr Icke falsely claimed there "is a link between 5G and this health crisis".

They ignore the fact that Icke predicted this 20 years ago.

26,000 Scientists vs "Policy Violation"

The 'powers that be' demand that voices critical of 5G be silenced, because they are false. No explanation. Just believe us. But what about the Petition signed by 26,000 Scientists Opposing the 5G Roll Out? I know of another by 5,000 scientists.

In principia-scientific.org Arthur Firstenberg writes:

"Stop The 5G Network On Earth And In Space, Devastating Impacts On Health And The Environment. *To the UN, WHO, EU, Council of Europe and governments of all nations*

"We the undersigned scientists, doctors, environmental organizations and citizens from () countries, urgently call for a halt to the deployment of the 5G (fifth generation) wireless network including 5G from space satellites. 5G will massively increase exposure to radio frequency (RF) radiation on top of the 2G, 3G and 4G networks for telecommunications already in place. RF radiation has been proven harmful for humans and the environment. The deployment of 5G constitutes an experiment on humanity and the environment that is defined as a crime under international law."

They continue:

"Despite widespread denial, the evidence that radio frequency (RF) radiation is harmful to life is already overwhelming. The accumulated clinical evidence of sick and injured human beings, experimental evidence of damage to DNA, cells and organ systems in a wide variety of plants and animals, and epidemiological evidence that the major diseases of modern civilization—cancer, heart disease and diabetes—are in large part caused by electromagnetic pollution, forms a literature base of well over 10,000 peer-reviewed studies."

"If the telecommunications industry's plans for 5G come to fruition, no person, no animal, no bird, no insect and no plant on Earth will be able to avoid exposure, 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, to levels of RF radiation that are tens to hundreds of times greater than what exists today, without any possibility of escape anywhere on the planet. These 5G plans threaten to provoke serious, irreversible effects on humans and permanent damage to all of the Earth's ecosystems."

The dollar overrides sanity and health.

Policy Violation

The BBC article continued:

"YouTube only deleted the content after the session had ended, despite being aware of the broadcast while it was ongoing. It changed its rules after the BBC questioned why the video was permitted. [Permitted?]

P
E
10
101

"We have clear policies that prohibit videos promoting **medically unsubstantiated methods to prevent the coronavirus** in place of seeking medical treatment [*Hang on, much of the advice being deleted is by medical professionals*], and we quickly remove videos violating these policies when flagged to us," a spokeswoman for YouTube told the BBC. "Now any content that disputes the existence or transmission of Covid-19, as described by the WHO [World Health Organization] and local health authorities is in violation of YouTube policies."

"This includes conspiracy theories which claim that the symptoms are caused by 5G."

But the BBC claims that conspiracy theories claiming "5G... helps transmit coronavirus" have been condemned by the scientific community, saying it's "complete rubbish". That makes sense, 5G could *not* "transmit" the virus — but might it affect a person's immune system?

So are 26,000 scientists delusional? At a US Congressional hearing, the tech companies admitted that NO research into health had been done.

Maybe detainment camps awaits those disgruntled with the 5G roll-out.

YouTube CEO: Anything that goes against the WHO is a violation of YouTube policies

<https://reclaimthenet.org/youtube-ceo-coronavirus-right-information-misinformation/>

- [By Tom Parker](#)
- [Posted 10:15 pm](#)

YouTube is also giving legacy media outlets and public health organizations billions of impressions.



In her first interview since the coronavirus lockdown started in the US, YouTube CEO Susan Wojcicki discussed how the platform has responded to the pandemic by removing thousands of videos and sending over 10 billion views to legacy media outlets.

Wojcicki made the comments during an appearance on CNN reporter Brian Stelter's [Reliable Sources](#) podcast where she mostly focused on the platform's efforts to give people the "right information" and stamp out "misinformation."

"We also talk about removing information that is problematic," Wojcicki said. "We've had to update our policy numerous times associated with COVID-19."

Wojcicki then went on to give examples of content that would be a violation of YouTube's policies, including anything "that is medically unsubstantiated, so people saying like, 'take vitamin C, take turmeric, like those are/or will cure you.' Those are the examples of things that would be a violation of our policy."

When it comes to determining what YouTube classes as "misinformation," Wojcicki said that "anything that would go against World Health Organization [WHO] recommendations would be a violation of our policy" – the same WHO that [amplified China's propaganda](#) about there being "no evidence of human-to-human transmission" of the coronavirus and [criticized Taiwan](#) after a [Chinese propaganda campaign on Twitter](#).

And when it comes to the sources of "right information," Wojcicki has chosen "authoritative sources" (legacy media outlets) and public health organizations – many of which were downplaying the severity of the coronavirus and [telling the public masks are not effective](#) as recently as late March, only to change their rhetoric in April to position the coronavirus as a much more serious threat and recommend wearing masks.



YouTube CEO Susan Wojcicki told CNN's Brian Stelter "anything that would go against World Health Organization recommendations" is a violation of YouTube's policies (CNN – Reliable Sources)

In terms of specific YouTube stats, Wojcicki said that:

- There's been a 75% increase in video views for authoritative sources since the start of 2020
- Public health organizations have had over 10 billion impressions
- The coronavirus news shelf has been viewed over 10 billion times

In addition to boosting views to these pre-selected sources by giving them preferential treatment in YouTube's recommendations, promoting them through banners on the site, and giving them prime positioning on the homepage via the coronavirus news shelf, Wojcicki said YouTube is also trying to "get the right voices out there" by arranging interviews between YouTubers and health experts.

Wojcicki also touched on the controversial changes YouTube has made over the last couple of years which have resulted in many creators being demonetized, having their content removed, or even having their entire channels deleted.

The YouTube CEO framed these changes as "progress" and said they've created an environment where "if you talk to most people," it's "really hard, if not impossible" to find misinformation.

During the second half of the interview, Wojcicki praised YouTube's use of machines to review and take down content and claimed that "they have been able to continue to be really effective during this time" – a reversal of the platform's previous sentiment that relying on automated systems during the pandemic will result in more deleted videos, including those that don't violate community guidelines.

The New York Times

<https://www.nytimes.com/2019/06/05/business/youtube-remove-extremist-videos.html>

YouTube to Remove Thousands of Videos Pushing Extreme Views



Content "alleging that a group is superior in order to justify discrimination, segregation or exclusion" and videos denying that violent incidents occurred will be removed, YouTube said Wednesday. Credit: Dado Ruvic/Reuters

By [Kevin Roose](#) and [Kate Conger](#)

June 5, 2019

• YouTube announced plans on Wednesday to remove thousands of videos and channels that advocate neo-Nazism, white supremacy and other bigoted ideologies in an attempt to clean up extremism and hate speech on its popular service.

The new policy will ban "videos alleging that a group is superior in order to justify discrimination, segregation or exclusion," the company said in a [blog post](#). The prohibition will also cover videos denying that violent events, like the mass shooting at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Connecticut, took place.

YouTube did not name any specific channels or videos that would be banned. But on Wednesday, numerous far-right creators began [complaining](#) that their videos had been deleted, or had been stripped of ads, presumably a result of the new policy.

"It's our responsibility to protect that, and prevent our platform from being used to incite hatred, harassment, discrimination and violence," the blog post said.

The decision by YouTube, which is owned by Google, is the latest action by a Silicon Valley company to stem the spread of hate speech and disinformation on its site. A month ago, Facebook [evicted seven](#) of its most controversial users, including Alex Jones, the conspiracy theorist and founder of Infowars. Twitter [barred Mr. Jones](#) last year.

The companies have come under intense criticism for their delayed reaction to the spread of hateful and false content. At the same time, [President Trump and others argue](#) that the giant tech platforms censor right-wing opinions, and the new policies put in place by the companies have inflamed those debates.

The tension was evident on Tuesday, when YouTube said a prominent right-wing creator who used racial language and homophobic slurs to harass a journalist in videos on YouTube did not

violate its policies. The decision set off a firestorm online, including accusations that YouTube was giving a free pass to some of its popular creators.

In the videos, that creator Steven Crowder, a conservative commentator with nearly four million YouTube subscribers, repeatedly insulted Carlos Maza, a journalist from Vox. Mr. Crowder used slurs about Mr. Maza's Cuban-American ethnicity and sexual orientation. Mr. Crowder said his comments were harmless, and YouTube determined that they did not break its rules.

"Opinions can be deeply offensive, but if they don't violate our policies, they'll remain on our site," YouTube said in a statement about its decision on Mr. Crowder.

On Wednesday, YouTube appeared to backtrack, saying that Mr. Crowder had, in fact, violated its rules, and that his ability to earn money from ads on his channel would be suspended as a result.

"We came to this decision because a pattern of egregious actions has harmed the broader community," the company wrote on Twitter.

The whiplash-inducing deliberations illustrated a central theme that has defined the moderation struggles of social media companies: Making rules is often easier than enforcing them.

"This is an important and long-overdue change," Becca Lewis, a research affiliate at the nonprofit organization Data & Society, said about the new policy. "However, YouTube has often executed its community guidelines unevenly, so it remains to be seen how effective these updates will be."

YouTube's scale — more than 500 hours of new videos are uploaded every minute — has made it difficult for the company to track rule violations. And the company's historically lax approach to moderating extreme videos has led to a drumbeat of scandals, including accusations that the site has promoted disturbing videos to children and allowed extremist groups to organize on its platform. YouTube's automated advertising system has paired offensive videos with ads from major corporations, prompting several advertisers to abandon the site.

The kind of content that will be prohibited under YouTube's new hate speech policies includes videos that claim Jews secretly control the world, that say women are intellectually inferior to men and therefore should be denied certain rights, or that suggest that the white race is superior to another race, a YouTube spokesman said.

Channels that post some hateful content, but that do not violate YouTube's rules with the majority of their videos, may receive strikes under YouTube's three-strike enforcement system, but would not be immediately banned.

The company also said channels that "repeatedly brush up against our hate speech policies" but don't violate them outright would be removed from YouTube's advertising program, which allows channel owners to share in the advertising revenue their videos generate.

In addition to tightening its hate speech rules, YouTube announced that it would tweak its recommendation algorithm, the automated software that shows users videos based on their interests and past viewing habits. This algorithm is responsible for more than 70 percent of overall time spent on YouTube, and has been a major engine for the platform's growth. But it has also drawn accusations of leading users down rabbit holes filled with extreme and divisive content, in an attempt to keep them watching and drive up the site's use numbers.

"If the hate and intolerance and supremacy is a match, then YouTube is lighter fluid," said Rashad Robinson, president of the civil rights nonprofit Color of Change. "YouTube and other platforms have been quite slow to address the structure they've created to incentivize hate."

In response to the criticism, YouTube announced in January that it would recommend fewer objectionable videos, such as those with conspiracy theories about the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks and vaccine misinformation, a category it called "borderline content." The YouTube spokesman said on Tuesday that the algorithm changes had resulted in a 50 percent drop in recommendations to such videos in the United States. He declined to share specific data about which videos YouTube considered "borderline."

"Our systems are also getting smarter about what types of videos should get this treatment, and we'll be able to apply it to even more borderline videos moving forward," the company's blog post said.

Other social media companies have faced criticism for allowing white supremacist content. Facebook recently banned a slew of accounts, including that of Paul Joseph Watson, a contributor to InfoWars, and Laura Loomer, a far-right activist. Twitter bans violent extremist groups but allows some of their members to maintain personal accounts — for instance, the Ku Klux Klan was barred from Twitter in August, while its former leader David Duke remains on the service.

Twitter is studying whether the removal of content is effective in stemming the tide of radicalization online. A Twitter spokesman declined to comment on the study.

When Twitter banned Mr. Jones, he responded with a series of videos denouncing the platform's decision and drumming up donations from his supporters.

YouTube's ban of white supremacists could prompt a similar cycle of outrage and grievance, said Joan Donovan, the director of the Technology and Social Change Research Project at Harvard. The ban, she said, "presents an opportunity for content creators to get a wave of media attention, so we may see some particularly disingenuous uploads."

"I wonder to what degree will the removed content be amplified on different platforms, and get a second life?" Ms. Donovan added.

A version of this article appears in print on June 6, 2019, Section B, Page 1 of the New York edition with the headline: YouTube Ban Addresses Extremism. [Order Reprints](#) | [Today's Paper](#) | [Subscribe](#)

Anyone who contradicts the corrupt, communist-run WHO is now in automatic violation of YouTube's policies

04/09/2020 / By [Ethan Huff](#)

<https://youtubeensorship.com/2020-04-09-anyone-who-contradicts-who-is-now-violating-youtube-policies.html>



A growing compendium of scientific evidence is linking 5G exposure to increased severity of Wuhan coronavirus (COVID-19) symptoms, though YouTube doesn't want you to know about this.

The Google-owned video platform, which for years has been censoring information that it deems unworthy of consideration, says that any allegation of 5G exacerbating Wuhan coronavirus (COVID-19) infections is a "conspiracy theory," and in violation of the platform's guidelines.

Even just questioning the official story of the World Health Organization (WHO), YouTube's ministry of propaganda for the Wuhan coronavirus (COVID-19), is no longer in line with YouTube's "community guidelines," which command total obedience to the globalist entity's decrees about the pandemic.

It is also no longer permitted to question or speak against the Wuhan coronavirus (COVID-19) itself, such as asking hypothetically whether it's really as serious as authorities are claiming.

"Now any content that disputes the existence or transmission of COVID-19, as described by the WHO and local health authorities, is in violation of YouTube policies," a company spokesman is quoted as saying in a recent statement.

This includes conspiracy theories which claim that the symptoms are caused by 5G.⁷

According to YouTube, anything other than what the WHO is saying about the Wuhan coronavirus (COVID-19) is "medically unsubstantiated," and thus not allowed on the YouTube platform because it might interfere with people rushing out to get treatment at the first signs of symptoms.

"We have clear policies that prohibit videos promoting medically unsubstantiated methods to prevent the coronavirus in place of seeking medical treatment, and we quickly remove videos violating these policies when flagged to us," the statement from YouTube goes on to explain.

"For borderline content that could misinform users in harmful ways, we reduce recommendations. We'll continue to evaluate the impact of these videos on communities around the world."

Be sure to listen below to *The Health Ranger Report* as Mike Adams, the Health Ranger, talks about some of the science showing that 5G does, in fact "turbo-charge" the Wuhan coronavirus (COVID-19) and make its symptoms even worse:

Brighteon will NEVER censor video content dealing with the health risks of 5G

YouTube recently pulled a London Real video featuring David Icke, who believes that 5G is part of a much larger globalist plot to take over society and control humanity. Icke discussed how people in Europe are now destroying 5G towers, and that an increasing number of people everywhere are opposed to their installation.

Whether Icke's claims are fully true, partially true, or not true at all is beside the point. What's disturbing is that, once again, YouTube has taken it upon itself to police all content that doesn't regurgitate the official government narrative on any given topic, in this case the Wuhan coronavirus (COVID-19).

Such behavior is precisely why we created the Brighteon.com platform, which exists as a free speech alternative to YouTube. You won't find any censorship of content on there that deals with the very real health risks associated with 5G technology, regardless of its link to the Wuhan coronavirus (COVID-19).

We tend to agree with Icke's overall conclusion that, "If 5G continues and reaches where they want to take it, human life as we know it is over – so people have to make a decision."

Again, this is true regardless of a potential link to the Wuhan coronavirus (COVID-19) because 5G uses intense, millimeter wave radiation to deliver coverage, and this type of radiation does not mesh well with the human frame, to put it simply.

You can learn more about the dangers of 5G by checking out [the powerful documentary film 5G Apocalypse: The Extinction Event](#).

You can also keep up with the latest news about the Wuhan coronavirus (COVID-19) by checking out [Pandemic news](#).

Sources for this article include: [infowars.com](#) [NaturalNews.com](#) [NaturalNews.com](#)

Columnist slams YouTube's censorship of viral video: 'These are doctors not activists'

By World Tribune on May 4, 2020

<https://www.worldtribune.com/columnist-slams-youtubes-censorship-of-viral-video-these-are-doctors-not-activists/>

Doctors Dan Erickson and Artin Maswih, from Accelerated Urgent Care in Bakersfield, California, posted a video calling the authoritarian ongoing government-imposed lockdowns unconstitutional activities, and said it was time to reopen America. The video received millions of views.

YouTube responded with censorship. The Google-owned video sharing platform removed the doctors' video.



Doctors Dan Erickson, left, and Artin Maswih

"The American people are sick and tired of the randomness with which they're being asked to comply with government dictates surrounding COVID-19, and of the ever-changing and outright false numbers on the coronavirus counts coming from hospitals that are then used to justify additional crackdowns on civil liberties," Washington Times columnist Cheryl K. Churnley noted on April 30.

"So they've begun to ask questions, challenge the status quo and even, in some cases, in some states, protest. And that is good."

YouTube's action "doesn't make the doctors' message disappear," Churnley wrote. "It only embeds it further in the minds of the millions who've already heard it. It only raises the red flags that have been raised in recent days over concerns about government's ongoing chipping of citizens' individual rights due to COVID-19 — it only raises these red flags higher."

YouTube explained the censorship this way: "We quickly remove flagged content that violates our Community Guidelines, including content that explicitly disputes the efficacy of local health authority recommended guidance on social distancing that may lead others to act against that guidance."

Churnley wrote: "This whole stifling of opinion and free expression is a dark blot on America. And it comes at a time when dark blots are everywhere. Not only is censorship un-American. Not only is the shutdown of free expression contrary to the First Amendment, and the core American principle of individual rights coming from God, not government.

"But on COVID-19, at this moment in time, at a place in history where Americans are being told to stay home, stay off the streets — except, say, to shop at Walmart or to buy marijuana — and to listen to the government's orders, and oh yes, shhh, to please ignore the fact the orders are based on faulty

computer models and false hospital reports, well, it seems counterintuitive to the cause of calming the citizenry to clamp a couple of doctors' doctorly-based COVID-19 analyses."

Chumley continued: "These are doctors, for crying out loud. Not activists. Aren't Americans being told daily to listen to the medical experts? Now it's only a select group of medical experts Americans are supposed to listen to and obey?"

YouTube "didn't just do a disservice to American freedoms by pulling these doctors' video feeds," Chumley wrote. "YouTube added to the confusion surrounding the coronavirus and to the growing suspicions about politicians' use of the virus for partisan gain — that some would use this crisis to stretch the bounds of government's authority ever more."

Chumley concluded: "The few Americans who weren't concerned about the fate of America's Constitution and freedoms and system of limited government, post-COVID-19, sure as heck are now. Nothing like some good old-fashioned censorship amid a constitutional crisis to raise the red flags on authoritarianism and ratchet fears further. And honestly, Americans are completely justified to worry."

YouTube just deleted a wildly popular video featuring a former KGB agent detailing how communists have taken over America's culture and government – but you can still watch it at Brighteon.com

<https://youtube.censorship.com/2019-12-25-youtube-deletes-video-former-kgb-detailing-communist-takeover-america.html>

12/25/2019 / By [Ethan Huff](#)



Rare video footage of a powerful interview with Soviet defector Yuri Bezmenov has been banned by YouTube as part of the Google-owned tech giant's latest censorship efforts against "hate speech."

A former KGB agent, Bezmenov had some not-so-nice things to say about the horrors of communism. He also warned that communism would eventually creep its way into the United States if Americans failed to spot it and deal with it.

This interview with Bezmenov took place back in the 1980s, by the way – and just as he warned it would, we're now seeing communism go mainstream. And ironically enough, one prominent example of its tactics of subversion is the escalating assault on free speech by YouTube and other Big Tech companies.

If Bezmenov were around today – he died back in 1993 – he'd likely be horrified at how quickly communism has basically become the official platform of today's Democrat Party. He'd also probably be shouting from the rooftops that if Americans don't reign in Big Tech and put an end to all of its censorship, then they might as well kiss the First Amendment goodbye.

We've reported on this Bezmenov interview before because it really is a type of modern-day prophecy regarding the potential future of our country. It wakes people up to the threat of communism and why it must be defeated – information that the fascists over at YouTube apparently don't want people to hear.

Fortunately, we were able to get a hold of this Bezmenov interview footage before YouTube scrubbed it from the internet, and it's now available for public viewing at Brighteon.com, the free speech alternative to YouTube.

See it at this link: <https://www.brighteon.com/ad11eefcd-e35f-4e37-ac6e-8ee7a2d05ca>

First they came for conservatives, and I did not speak out – because I was not a conservative

As we're now seeing all across the tech spectrum, the information gatekeepers are desperate to control the narrative, just like communists have always done throughout history. But they can't do this with a free and open internet, which is why they've infiltrated tech corporations like YouTube in order to control the content that's published there.

They say it's to fight "hate speech," of course, but we know that there's actually no such thing.

"Silent speech" is little more than a code phrase used to disguise the online censorship agenda of Silicon Valley, which right this moment is constructing a new internet 2.0 that, just like what currently exists in communist China, is 100 percent censored and controlled by a select few at the top of the totem pole.

We continue to warn our readers, regardless of where they fall on the political spectrum, that censorship is *never* a good thing, regardless of who's being censored. Even if you don't like what someone else has to say, telling him that he *can't* say it crosses a hard line that our founders put in place for a reason – because eventually that censorship will apply to *everyone*.

One of the key tenets of nearly every communist takeover throughout history involved stripping the citizenry of their free speech rights. Budding dictators also used many of the same excuses as today's tech giants in order to do it, such as claiming that they were fighting "hate" from society's "troublemakers."

It's the type of thing that Bezhmerov fled when he defected from the KGB and set out to warn others about what he witnessed while a member of the former Soviet Union's "deep state." But people didn't listen to him, or at least not enough of them, because look where we are today.

If YouTube really stood for freedom and liberty, it would be *promoting* videos like the Bezhmerov interview, not suppressing and deleting them. And to the leftists who think they're immune to this Big Tech censorship, be warned: *your content is next*.

To keep up with the latest censorship stories, be sure to check out [Censorship.news](#).

Sources for this article include:

[InformationLiberation.com](#)

[NaturalNews.com](#)

[Brianteton.com](#)

[NaturalNews.com](#)

Carlson Blasts YouTube Over Censorship of Coronavirus Video



[Leah Barkoukis@LeahBarkoukis](mailto:LeahBarkoukis@LeahBarkoukis)

[Posted: Apr 30, 2020 7:30 AM]

<https://townhall.com/tipsheet/leahbarkoukis/2020/04/30/carlson-blasts-youtube-over-censorship-of-coronavirus-video-n2567846>



Source: AP Photo/Reed Saxon, File

There is disagreement in the medical community over how much longer many parts of the country should be under strict lockdown orders. In California, two Bakersfield-area doctors are pushing for Gov. Gavin Newsom to lift the order.

Their recommendation came after looking at the statistics from their urgent care facility, which they said showed coronavirus was similar to the flu. Other doctors in the state disagreed.

The video, which featured Dr. Daniel Erickson, was viewed millions of times but then was removed for violating YouTube's terms, which Fox News's Tucker Carlson found to be the most troubling aspect of the story.

If there is one thing Americans need more of right now, it's informed debate, he argued, and that's exactly what authorities don't want.

Carlson's remarks came after YouTube removed a highly circulated video featuring Dr. Daniel Erickson of Bakersfield, Calif. In the video, Erickson alleged that doctors were encouraged to link deaths to COVID-19 to amplify concerns about the pandemic. (FoxNews.com)

"Viewers of Erickson's video were shocked and transfixed by this. They forwarded the videos to friends, who forwarded it on to their friends and suddenly millions of people who spent the last six weeks on a diet of 'Tiger King' and internet memes were watching sober-minded medical researchers reading from charts of statistics," Carlson said.

"Last night the doctor's video was pulled off of YouTube. It wasn't an accident, YouTube admitted doing it. The company cited a violation of company guidelines and didn't apologize."

"When this is all over, it's likely we'll look back on this moment, what YouTube just did, as a turning point in the way we live in this country, a sharp break with 250 years of law and custom," Carlson said.

He noted that the video was made by a local news station and there was absolutely no reason to remove it other than the fact that it disagreed with those in power.

"It was a form of dissent from orthodoxy. YouTube and its parent company Google have now officially banned dissent," Carlson said.

YouTube's CEO Susan Wojcicki said Sunday that content considered "problematic" and that went against the World Health Organization's recommendations would be removed.

Carlson of course pointed out how absurd it was to follow that standard since the WHO has been wrong about the pandemic from the start, at first reassuring people there was no human-to-human transmission, that travel shouldn't be restrict, then saying face masks don't work.

"Those are lies and they were welcome on Google's platforms. Doctors who were treating patients with the virus, meanwhile, have just been banned," Carlson said. "So no. This is not about science. Censorship never is about science, it's about power. Big technology companies are using this tragedy to increase their power over the population."

YouTube is now banning “wrongthink” by labeling it “hate”... but it’s really just a way to silence anyone who disagrees with the twisted agendas of the radical Left

12/17/2019 / By [Ethan Huff](#)

<https://voutubecensorship.com/2019-12-17-youtube-banning-wrongthink-by-labeling-it-hate.html>



Just when we thought that YouTube had finally hit rock bottom with its outrageous censorship tactics, along comes yet another company announcement about how YouTube channels and videos that violate the platform’s new “acceptable thoughts” policies will soon, if they haven’t already, be censored or deleted.

Following line-by-line the supposedly fictitious concepts laid out in George Orwell’s dystopian novel *1984*, YouTube is well on its way towards policing every single thought, idea, sentiment, joke, and even facial expression in the video content published to its platform. And anything that doesn’t meet the corporation’s arbitrary “acceptable thoughts” threshold can now expect to be shadow-banned, de-platformed, demonetized, or banned.

“@YouTube,” announced YouTube CEO Susan Wojcicki on her Twitter account, adding that “we take it very seriously when creators share stories about harassment. Today we announced an

...harassment policy that will help make YouTube a better place for everyone," she
...added.

The only people who can be victims of "harassment" on YouTube are LGBTQs and others from protected leftist groups

So, what constitutes "harassment," exactly? According to YouTube, it's anything that "hurts our community by making people less inclined to share their opinions and engage with each other." In other words, snowflakes who are easily offended by anything that challenges their particular worldviews will simply have to claim "harassment" in order to silence their detractors.

Keep in mind that this "harassment" policy really only applies to content that offends the Cult of LGBTQ, or one of the other leftist special interest groups that's routinely catered to by Big Tech. It doesn't apply to Christians who are being harassed by atheists, for instance, or conservatives who are harassed by liberals.

Correctly pointing out, using biological fact, that there are only two genders, as one prominent example, is considered by YouTube to be "harassment." It is also considered "harassment" to point out on YouTube that many Drag Queen Story Hour events are being hosted by perverts, pedophiles, and other convicted sex predators who are being allowed easy access to young children in the name of "tolerance" and "pride."

One Twitter user, responding to Wojcicki's announcement about her company's new "harassment" policies, highlighted all of this using a simple list which reads as follows:

- Criticism: harassment
- Different opinions: harassment
- Cold hard facts: harassment
- Edgy humor: harassment
- Demonization: apparent
- YouTube?: Dying.

Thanks Susan!

Like I said, 1 step forward, 2 steps back."

It's important to note that video content isn't the only thing that YouTube will now be probing for anything that might be considered "harassment." The company will also be scoping the comment sections on videos to look for anything that an LGBTQ might find to be "offensive" — though YouTube claims that it's not looking for merely "negative or critical" comments.

The problem is that YouTube's definitions of "harassment" are so incredibly vague that almost anything could be deemed as "harassment" should one of YouTube's manual censors personally deem it as such.

"The entire reason YouTube became massive was YouTubers having beef and drama," tweeted conservative commentator and writer Paul Joseph Watson, who's endured his own share of "harassment" in the form of having his social media and tech accounts routinely targeted with Big Tech censorship.

"The line between criticism and 'harassment' is now so blurred, nobody knows where they stand," he added.

Pretty soon, the only people who will be allowed on YouTube, or any other tech media for that matter, are those who agree to parrot the propaganda of the deep state. There's already very little, if any, room for alternative viewpoints that contradict the prevailing narratives of our day.

Be sure to check out [Brighteon.com](https://www.brighteon.com), the free speech alternative to YouTube.

Sources for this article include:

[NaturalNews.com](https://www.naturalnews.com)

[SIFTplan.com](https://www.siftplan.com)

Censorship by Google

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Censorship_by_Google

This article's lead section may not adequately summarize its contents. To comply with Wikipedia's [lead section guidelines](#), please consider modifying the lead to [provide an accessible overview](#) of the article's key points in such a way that it can stand on its own as a concise version of the article. *(March 2017)*

Google and its subsidiary companies, such as **YouTube**, have removed or omitted information from its services to comply with its company policies, legal demands, and government censorship laws.^[1] Google's censorship varies between countries and their regulations, and ranges from advertisements to speeches. Over the years, the search engine's censorship policies and targets have also differed, and have been the source of internet censorship debates.^[2]

Numerous governments have asked Google to censor what they publish. In 2012, Google voted in favor of more than half of the requests they received via court orders and phone calls. This did not include China and Iran who had blocked their site entirely.^[3]

In February 2007, Google stopped showing the advertisements of **Oceana**, a non-profit organization protesting against a major cruise ship operator's sewage treatment practices. Google cited its editorial policy at the time, stating "Google does not accept advertising if the ad or site advocates against other individuals, groups, or organizations."^[4] The policy was later changed.^[5]

In April 2008, Google refused to run ads for a UK Christian group opposed to abortion, explaining that "At this time, Google policy does not permit the advertisement of websites that contain 'abortion and religion'".^[6]

In April 2010, though Google accepts ads from the pro-choice abortion lobbying group **NARAL**, they have removed ads for some anti-abortion **crisis pregnancy centers**. Google removed the Web search ads after an investigation by NARAL found evidence that the ads violate Google's policy against deceptive advertising. According to NARAL, people using Google to search for "abortion clinics" got ads advertising crisis pregnancy centers that were in fact anti-abortion. Google said in a statement that it had followed normal company procedures in applying its ad policy standards related to ad relevance, clarity, and accuracy in this case.^{[7][8]}

In September 2018, Google has removed from its YouTube website a paid advertisement placed by supporters of Russian opposition urging Russians to participate in a protest set for September 9. Russia's Central Election Commission earlier sent a request to Google to remove the advertisement, saying it violated election laws that call for a "day of silence" on election matters ahead of voting, but the advertisement was blocked even in regions where there is no voting set for September 9 and in regions where authorities have authorized the pension-reform protests.^[9]

Google Maps - See also: **Google Maps**

In March 2007, allegedly lower resolution satellite imagery on **Google Maps** showing post-**Hurricane Katrina** damage in the U.S. state of **Louisiana** was replaced with higher resolution images from before the storm.^[10] Google's official blog of April revealed that the imagery was still available in **KML format** on **Google Earth** or **Google Maps**.^{[11][12]}

In March 2008, Google removed Street View and 360 degree images of military bases per **The Pentagon's** request.^[13]

To protect the privacy and anonymity of individuals, Google selectively blurred photographs containing car license number plates and people's faces in **Google Street View**. Users may request further blurring of images that feature the user, their family, their car or their home. Users can also request the removal of images that feature what Google term "inappropriate content", which falls under their categories of: Intellectual property violations; sexually explicit content; illegal, dangerous, or violent content; child endangerment; hate speech; harassment and threats; personal or confidential information.^[14] In some countries (e.g. Germany) it modifies images of specific buildings.^[15] In the United States, Google Street View adjusts or omits certain images deemed of interest to national security by the federal government.^[16]

Google Search See also: [Google Search](#)

In the United States, Google commonly filters search results to comply with [Digital Millennium Copyright Act](#)-related legal complaints,¹²⁸³ such as in 2002 when Google filtered out websites that provided information critical of [Scientology](#).¹²⁸⁴

In the United Kingdom, it was reported that Google had 'delisted' [Inquisition 21st century](#), a website which claims to challenge moral authoritarian and sexually absolutist ideas in the United Kingdom. Google later released a press statement suggesting [Inquisition 21](#) had attempted to manipulate search results.¹²⁸⁵ In Germany and France, a study reported that approximately 113 [white nationalist](#), [Nazi anti-semitic](#), [Islamic extremist](#) and other websites had been removed from the German and French versions of Google.¹²⁸⁶ Google has complied with these laws by not including sites containing such material in its search results. However, Google does list the number of excluded results at the bottom of the search result page and links to [Lumen](#) (formerly [Chilling Effects](#)) for explanation.¹²⁸⁷

Lolicon content

As of April 18, 2016, Google censors the term "lolicon" on its search results, stopping users from finding meaningful results regarding lolicon material, even if the user types words along with the term which would typically lead to explicit content results; the terms "hiii" and "lolim" also suffer from censorship when it is attempted to find meaningful results on the subject.¹²⁸⁸

Removal of SafeSearch options Main article: [SafeSearch](#)

As of December 12, 2012, in the U.S., U.K., Australia and some other countries Google removed the option to turn off the [SafeSearch](#) image filter entirely, forcing users to enter more specific search queries to get adult content. Prior to the change three SafeSearch settings—"on", "moderate", and "off"—were available to users. Following the change, two "Filter explicit results" settings—"on" and "off"—were newly established. The former and new "on" settings are similar, and exclude explicit images from search results. The new "off" setting still permits explicit images to appear in search results, but users need to enter more specific search requests, and no direct equivalent of the old "off" setting exists following the change because adding additional explicit search terms alters the search results. The change turns image search results into line with Google's existing settings for web and video search.¹²⁸⁹

Some users have stated that the lack of a completely unfiltered option amounts to "censorship" by Google. A Google spokesperson disagreed, saying that Google is "not censoring any adult content," but "want to show users exactly what they are looking for—but we aim not to show sexually-explicit results unless a user is specifically searching for them."¹²⁹⁰

Online pharmacies

Following a settlement with the [United States Food and Drug Administration](#) ending [Omnicell AdvaNce](#) advertising of Canadian pharmacies that permitted Americans access to cheap prescriptions, Google agreed to several compliance and reporting measures to limit visibility of "rogue pharmacies". Google and other members of the [Center for Safe Internet Pharmacies](#) are collaborating to remove illegal pharmacies from search results, and participating in "Operation Pledge" with the [FDA](#) and [Interpol](#).¹²⁹¹

Search suggestions See also: [Search suggest drop-down list](#) and [Criticism of Google & Web search](#)

In January 2010, Google was reported to have stopped providing automatic suggestions for any search beginning with the term "Islam is", while it continued to do so for other major religions. According to [Wired.com](#), a Google spokesperson stated, "this is a bug and we're working to fix it as quickly as we can."¹²⁹² Suggestions for "Islam is" were available later that month. The word "[Bildergberg](#)" and the family name "[Buchanan](#)" were also reportedly censored in the auto-complete results,¹²⁹³ but were available by February 2010 as well. Nonetheless, Google continues to filter certain words from auto-complete suggestions,¹²⁹⁴ describing them as "potentially inappropriate".¹²⁹⁵

2011: The Hacker Quarterly has compiled a list of words that are restricted by Google Instant.¹²¹ These are words that the company's Instant Search feature will not search.¹²² Most terms are often vulgar and derogatory in nature, but some are apparently irrelevant searches including "Myleak" that are removed.¹²³

As of January 30, 2011, Google's Auto Complete feature would not complete domain words such as "bitorrent", "torrent", "utorrent", "megaupload", and "rapidshare", and Google actively censors search terms or phrases that its algorithm considers as likely constituting spam or intending to manipulate search results.¹²⁴

In September 2012, multiple sources reported that Google had removed hexagram from the list of blacklisted terms for Instant Search.¹²⁵

Un-googleable

In 2013, the Swedish Language Council included the Swedish version of the word un-googleable (un-googelbar [sv]) in its list of new words.¹²⁶ It had "defined the term as something that cannot be found with any search engine".¹²⁷ Google objected to its definition, wanting it to only refer to Google searches, and the Council removed it in order to avoid a legal confrontation.¹²⁸ They also accused Google of trying to "control the Swedish language".¹²⁹

Linked celebrity content

Main article: Cloud celebrity-nhina leaks

On August 31, 2011, almost 200 private pictures of various celebrities, containing nudity and explicit content, were made public on certain websites. Google was criticized for linking to such content after some of them became popular enough to reach the front page of some search results.¹³⁰ Shortly after, Google removed most search results that linked users directly to such content from the incident.¹³¹

National

Australia

In January 2010, Google Australia removed links to satirical website Knowonpedia Dramatica's "Aboriginal" article citing it as a violation of Australia's Racial Discrimination Act.¹³² After the website's domain change in 2011, the article resurfaced in Google Australia's search results.

Canada

On 19 June 2014, it was reported that Google had been ordered to remove search results that linked to websites of a company called Datalink by the Supreme Court of British Columbia. The websites in question sell network device technology that Datalink is alleged to have stolen from Equustek Solutions. Google voluntarily removed links from google.ca, the main site used by Canadians, but the court granted a temporary injunction applying to all Google sites across the world.¹³³ Google argued that Canadian law would not be imposed across the world but was given until 27 June 2014 to comply with the court's ruling.¹³⁴

China Main article: Google China

Google adhered to the Internet censorship policies of China¹³⁵ enforced by means of filters colloquially known as "The Great Firewall of China" until March 2010. Google.cn search results were filtered so as not to bring up any results perceived to be harmful to the People's Republic of China (PRC).¹³⁶ Google claimed that some censorship is necessary in order to keep the Chinese government from blocking Google entirely, as occurred in 2002.¹³⁷

Google claimed it did not plan to give the government information about users who search for blocked content, and will inform users that content has been restricted if they attempt to search for it.¹³⁸ As of 2009, Google was the only major China-based search engine to explicitly inform the user when search results are blocked or hidden. As of December 2012, Google no longer informs the user of possible censorship for certain queries during search.¹³⁹ The Chinese government has

restricted citizens' access to popular search engines such as AltaVista, Yahoo!, and Google in the past. This complete ban has since been lifted.¹²⁰² However, the government remains active in filtering Internet content. In October 2005, Blogger and access to the Google Cache were made available in mainland China; however, in December 2005, some mainland Chinese users of Blogger reported that their access to the site was once again restricted.¹²⁰³

In January 2006, Google agreed that the China's version of Google, Google.cn, would filter certain keywords given to it by the Chinese government.¹²⁰⁴ Google pledged to tell users when search results are censored and said that it would not "maintain any services that involve personal or confidential data, such as Gmail or Blogger, on the mainland."¹²⁰⁵ Google said that it does not plan to give the government information about users who search for blocked content, and will inform users that content has been restricted if they attempt to search for it. Searches may encounter a message which states: "In accordance with local laws and policies, some of the results have not been displayed."¹²⁰⁶ Google issued a statement saying that "removing search results is inconsistent with Google's mission" but that the alternative — being shut down entirely and thereby "providing no information (or a heavily degraded user experience that amounts to no information) is more inconsistent with our mission."¹²⁰⁷ Initially, both the censored Google.cn and the uncensored Chinese-language Google.com were available. In June 2006, however, China blocked Google.com once more.¹²⁰⁸

Some Chinese Internet users were critical of Google for assisting the Chinese government in repressing its own citizens, particularly those dissenting against the government and advocating for human rights.¹²⁰⁹ Furthermore, Google had been denounced and called hypocritical by Free Media Movement and Reporters Without Borders for agreeing to China's demands while simultaneously fighting the United States government's requests for similar information.¹²¹⁰ Google China had also been condemned by Reporters Without Borders,¹²¹¹ Human Rights Watch,¹²¹² and Amnesty International.¹²¹³

On February 14, 2006, protesters organized in a "miss breakup with Google" whereby users agreed to boycott Google on Valentine's Day to show their disapproval of the Google China policy.¹²¹⁴

In June 2009, Google was ordered by the Chinese government to block various overseas websites, including some with sexually explicit content. Google was criticized by the China Illegal Information Reporting Center (CIIRC) for allowing search results that included content that was sexual in nature, claiming the company was a dissemination channel for a "huge amount of porn and low-level content".¹²¹⁵

On January 22, 2010, in response to an apparent hacking of Google's servers in an attempt to access information about Chinese dissidents, Google announced that "we are no longer willing to continue censoring our results on Google.cn and so over the next few weeks we will be discussing with the Chinese government the basis on which we could operate an unfiltered search engine within the law, if at all."¹²¹⁶

On March 22, 2010, after talks with Chinese authorities failed to reach an agreement, the company redirected its censor-complying Google China service to its Google Hong Kong service, which is outside the jurisdiction of Chinese censorship laws. However, as of at least March 23, 2010, "The Great Firewall" continues to censor search results from the Hong Kong portal, www.google.com.hk (as it does with the US portal, www.google.com) for controversial terms such as "Tiananmen" and "the June 4th incident" (Tiananmen Square incident).¹²¹⁷

In the August 2018, it was revealed that Google was working on a version of its search engine for use in China, which would censor content according to the restrictions placed by the Chinese government. This project was working on by a small percentage of the company, and was codenamed Dragonfly. A number of Google employees expressed their concern about the project, and several resigned.¹²¹⁸

European Union

In July 2014 Google began removing certain search results from its search engines in the European Union in response to requests under the right to be forgotten. Articles whose links were removed, when searching for specific personal names, included a 2007 blog by the BBC journalist Robert Peston about Sean O'Neil, a former chairman of investment bank Merrill Lynch, being forced out after the bank made huge losses.¹²¹⁹ Peston criticized Google for "...cast[ing him] into oblivion".¹²²⁰

The Guardian reported that six of its articles, including three relating to a former Scottish football referee, had been "hidden".¹²²¹ Other articles, including one about French office workers using post-it notes and another about a collapsed fraud trial of a witness standing for election to the Law Society's ruling body, were affected.¹²²²

Skynews.com reported that a story about Kelly Osbourne falling ill on the set of Fashion Police in 2018 had been removed.¹¹¹²

The Oxford Mail reported that its publishers had been notified by Google about the removal of links to the story of a conviction for shoplifting in 2006. The paper said it was not known who had asked Google to remove the search result, but there had been a previous complaint to the Press Complaints Commission (PCC) in 2010, concerning accuracy and claiming that the report was causing "embarrassment", requesting the story to be taken off the paper's website. The paper said two factual amendments were made to the article and the PCC dismissed the complaint.¹¹¹³

An article about the conversion to Islam of the brother of George Osborne, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, was removed after a request to Google from an unknown person under the right-to-be-forgotten ruling.¹¹¹⁴

The Telegraph reported that links in a report on its website about claims that a former Law Society chief faked complaints against his deputy were hidden.¹¹¹⁵ The search results for the articles for the same story in the Guardian and the Independent were also removed.¹¹¹⁶ The Independent reported that its article, together with an article on the Indian Ocean tsunami in 2004 and one on new trends in sofa design in 1998, had been removed.¹¹¹⁷ The Telegraph also reported that links to articles concerning a student's 2008 drink-driving conviction and a 2001 case that resulted in two brothers each receiving nine-month jail terms for affray had been removed.¹¹¹⁸

The Spanish newspaper El Mundo reported that some results were hidden over a 2018 news report¹¹¹⁹ of a Spanish Supreme Court ruling involving executives of Riviera Coast Invest who were involved in a mortgage mis-selling scandal.¹¹²⁰

On 5 July 2014, German news magazine Der Spiegel reported removal of a search result to an article about Scientology.¹¹²¹

On 19 August 2014, the BBC reported that Google had removed 12 links to stories on BBC News.¹¹²²

Germany and France

On October 21, 2002, a study reported that approximately 113 Internet sites had been removed from the German and French versions of Google.¹¹²³ This censorship mainly affected White Nationalist, Nazi, anti-semitic, Islamic extremist websites and at least one fundamentalist Christian¹¹²⁴ website. Under French and German law, hate speech and Holocaust denial are illegal. In the case of Germany, violent or sex-related sites such as YouPorn and BME that the Bundesprüfstelle für jugendgefährdende Medien deems harmful to youth are also censored.

Google has complied with these laws by not including sites containing such material in its search results. However, Google does list the number of excluded results at the bottom of the search result page and links to Lumen (formerly known as Chilling Effects) for explanation.¹¹²⁵

Sweden

In March 2018, Google delisted a WordPress-based site from search results in Sweden,¹¹²⁶ following an intense media frenzy targeted against Google, YouTube and Facebook by the tabloid Expressen and the daily newspaper Dagens Nyheter.¹¹²⁷ The WordPress site likes Swedish Jews in the public sphere, and also agitates against the dominant publishing house Bonnier Group and its soft power.¹¹²⁸ Bonnier Group is the owner of both newspapers.

Although perfectly legal in Sweden, the WordPress site was described as anti-semitic.¹¹²⁹ The Bonnier papers argued that Google should not promote such content, and above all not at a high rank. Ministers in the Swedish green-left government agreed with this sentiment, and threatened with national and EU regulation unless Google adapt its algorithms and delist contents of "threats and lies" (fäkt och lögn).¹¹³⁰ Google eventually delisted the site in Sweden due to copyright claims.

Said papers also targeted the YouTube channel Granskning Sverige (Scrutiny Sweden) for its alleged extreme right-wing comments.¹¹³¹ The channel was described as a "mill factory", where members called authorities, journalists and other public figures and read the recorded interviews to make them fit the channel's right wing extremist world view.¹¹³² The interviews were broadcast against a black backdrop with the channel logo, and the occasional use of screen dumps from

newspaper articles related to the interviews.¹⁵⁵ Google eventually complied with the demands, and closed the channel citing copyright infringement and violation of terms of agreement.¹⁵⁶

On April 13, 2018, Google took part in a meeting with the Swedish government to discuss the search company's role in the media landscape.¹⁵⁷ Minister of Justice, Morgan Johansson (Social Democrats), and Minister of Digitization, Peter Eriksson (Green Party), expressed concerns that "unlawful" and "harmful" content was facilitated by Google, and that "trolls" could have a negative impact on the upcoming Swedish parliamentary election. Google agreed to refine its algorithms, and also hire more staff to make sure "threats and hate" (*hot och hat*) are eliminated from Google search and YouTube videos.¹⁵⁸ Critics have voiced concerns that private international companies are mandated to put censorship into effect to comply with local regulations without guidance from courts, and that free speech is deteriorating at an accelerating rate.¹⁵⁹

India

In September 2016, the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare revealed that Google had agreed to censor search results and advertising of premarital sex discernment, which is illegal in India.¹⁶⁰

Israel

Since 2015, Google removed certain search results from its search engine in Israel, following rag orders.¹⁶¹

United Kingdom

On 21 September 2006,¹⁶² it was reported that Google had 'delisted' Inquisition 21st Century, a website which claims to challenge moral authoritarian and sexually absolutist ideas in the United Kingdom. According to Inquisition 21, Google was acting "in support of a campaign by law enforcement agencies in the US and UK to suppress emerging information about their involvement in major malpractice", allegedly exposed by their own investigation of and legal action against those who carried out Operation Ore, a far reaching and much criticized law enforcement campaign against the viewers of child pornography.¹⁶³ Google released a press statement suggesting Inquisition 21 had attempted to manipulate search results.¹⁶⁴

United States

Google commonly removes search results to comply with Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA)-related legal complaints.¹⁶⁵

In 2002, "in an apparent response to criticism of its handling of a flagging letter from a Church of Scientology lawyer," Google began to make DMCA "take-down" letters public, posting such notices on the Chilling Effects archive (now Lumen), which archives legal threats made against Internet users and Internet sites.¹⁶⁶

In mid-2010, Google conducted a two-month standoff with writer Dennis Cooper after deleting his Blogger and Gmail accounts without warning or explanation following a single anonymous complaint. The case drew worldwide media attention, and finally resulted in Google returning Cooper's content to him.¹⁶⁷

In mid-2018, Google permanently barred conspiracy theorist Alex Jones from using its subsidiary company YouTube. Jones' channel Infowars responded by "accusing the companies of censorship."¹⁶⁸

In mid-2019, Google allegedly suspended Tulsi Gabbard's advertisements for her presidential campaign, while the candidate was at the height of public interest.¹⁶⁹ Gabbard sued Google for \$50 million in damages.¹⁷⁰

International

See also: Comparison of web search engines

In June 2017 the Canadian supreme court ruled that Google can be forced to remove search results worldwide. Civil liberties groups including Human Rights Watch, the BC Civil Liberties Association, and the Electronic Frontier Foundation argue that this would set a precedent for Internet censorship. In an appeal Google argued that the global reach of the order was unnecessary and that it raised concerns over freedom of expression. While the court writes that "we have not, to date, accepted that freedom of expression requires the facilitation of the unlawful sale of goods" OpenMedia spokesman David Christopher warns that "there is great risk that governments and commercial entities will see this ruling as justifying censorship requests that could result in perfectly legal and legitimate content disappearing off the web because of a court order in the opposite corner of the globe".^{1108,1109}

YouTube See also: Criticism of Google & YouTube

YouTube, a video-sharing website and subsidiary of Google, in its Terms of Service, prohibits the posting of videos which violate copyrights or depict pornography, illegal acts, gratuitous violence, hate speech, scientific information about COVID-19.¹¹¹⁰ User-posted videos that violate such terms may be removed and replaced with a message that reads, "This video has been removed due to a violation of our Terms of Service."

In September 2007, YouTube blocked the account of Wael Aboua, an Egyptian activist who posted videos of police brutality, voting irregularities and anti-government demonstrations under the Mubarak regime.¹¹¹¹ Shortly afterward, his account was subsequently restored,¹¹¹² and later also 187 of his videos.¹¹¹³

In 2006, Thailand blocked access to YouTube after identifying 20 offensive videos it ordered the site to remove.¹¹¹⁴ In 2007, a Turkish judge ordered YouTube to be blocked in the country due to videos insulting Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the founder of the Republic of Turkey (which falls under Article 301 prohibitions on insulting the Turkish nation).¹¹¹⁵ In February 2008, the Pakistani Telecommunications Authority banned YouTube in the country, but the manner in which it performed the block accidentally prevented access to the website worldwide for several hours.¹¹¹⁶ The ban was lifted after YouTube removed controversial religious comments made by a Dutch government official concerning Islam.^{1117,1118}

In October 2008, YouTube removed a video by Pat Condell titled Welcome to Saudi Britain; in response, his fans re-uploaded the video themselves and the National Secular Society wrote to YouTube in protest.¹¹¹⁹

In 2016, YouTube launched a localized Pakistani version of its website for the users in Pakistan in order to censor content considered blasphemous by the Pakistani government as a part of its deal with the latter. As a result, the three-year ban on YouTube by the Pakistani government was subsequently lifted.^{1120,1121}

Advertiser-friendly content

YouTube policies restrict certain forms of content from being included in videos being monetized with advertising, including strong violence, language, sexual content, and "controversial or sensitive subjects and events, including subjects related to war, political conflicts, natural disasters and tragedies, even if graphic imagery is not shown", unless the content is "usually newsworthy or comedic and the creator's intent is to inform or entertain".¹¹²²

In August 2016, YouTube introduced a new system to notify users of violations of the "advertiser-friendly content" rules, and allow them to appeal. Following its introduction, many prominent YouTube users began to accuse the site of engaging in *de facto* censorship, arbitrarily disabling monetization on videos discussing various topics such as skin care, politics, and LGBT history. Philip DeFranco argued that not being able to earn money from a video was "censorship by a different name", while Vlogbrothers similarly pointed out that YouTube had flagged both "Zentari thoughts from a refugee camp" and "Vegetables that look like penises" (although the flagging on the former was eventually overturned).¹¹²³ The hashtag "#YouTubeIsOverParty" was prominently used on Twitter as a means of discussing the controversy. A YouTube spokesperson stated that "while our policy of demonetizing videos due to advertiser-friendly concerns hasn't changed, we've recently improved the notification and appeal process to ensure better communication to our creators."^{1124,1125,1126}

In March 2017, a number of major advertisers and prominent companies began to pull their advertising campaigns from YouTube, over concerns that their ads were appearing on objectionable and/or extremist content, in what the YouTube community began referring to as a "boycott".^{1127,1128} YouTube personality PewDiePie described these boycotts as an "apocalypse", noting that his video revenue had fallen to the point that he was generating more revenue from YouTube

Real subscription profit sharing (which is divided based on views by subscribers) than advertising.¹¹²¹ On April 6, 2017, YouTube announced planned changes to its Partner Program, restricting new membership to vetted channels with a total of at least 10,000 video views. YouTube stated that the changes were made in order to "ensure revenue only flows to creators who are playing by the rules".¹¹²²

In July 2017, YouTube began modifying suggested videos to debunk terrorist ideologies.¹¹²³ In August 2017, YouTube wrote a blog post explaining a new "limited state" for religious and controversial videos, which wouldn't allow comments, likes, monetization and suggested videos.¹¹²⁴

In October 2017, PragerU sued YouTube, alleging violations of their "freedom of speech under the First Amendment via YouTube's "arbitrary and capricious use of restricted mode" and "demonetization" viewer restriction filters" to suppress their content. A U.S. district appeals court threw out the suit in February 2020, stating that despite "its ubiquity and its role as a public-facing platform", YouTube was still considered a private platform (the First Amendment only applies to state actors).¹¹²⁵

In March 2018, The Atlantic found that YouTube had de-listed a video where journalist Daniel Lombroso reported a speech by white nationalist Richard B. Spencer at the 2016 annual conference of the National Policy Institute, where they celebrated Donald Trump's win at the presidential election.¹¹²⁶ YouTube re-listed the video after The Atlantic sent a complaint.

In June 2019, YouTube updated its hate speech policy to prohibit hateful and supremacist work to limit the spread of violent extremist content online. This content includes that justify discrimination, segregation or exclusion based on qualities like age, gender, race, caste, religion, sexual orientation or veteran status. For example, videos that which include Nazi ideology, Holocaust denial, Sandy Hook conspiracy theories, or flat Earth theories. The policy also aims to reducing borderline content and harmful misinformation, such as videos promoting phony miracle cures for serious illnesses.¹¹²⁷

In February 2020, YouTube reportedly began censoring any content related to the novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) by removal or demonetisation citing "sensitive topics" advertiser-friendly content guideline on Twitter.^{1128,1129}

Censorship of sexual content in Restricted Mode

In March 2017, the "Restricted Mode" feature was criticized by YouTube's LGBT community for filtering videos that discuss issues of human sexuality and sexual and gender identity, even when there is no explicit references to sexual intercourse or otherwise inappropriate content.^{1130,1131} Rapper Mykki Blanco told The Guardian that such restrictions are used to make LGBT viewers feel "policed and demoralized" and "sends a clear homophobic message that the fact that my video displays unapologetic queer imagery means it's slapped with an 'age restriction', while other, e.g. overly sexualized heteronormative work" remain uncensored.¹¹³² Musicians Jean and Sara similarly argued that LGBT people "shouldn't be restricted", after acknowledging that the mode had censored several of their music videos.¹¹³³

YouTube later stated that a technical error on Restricted Mode wrongfully impacted "hundreds of thousands" LGBT-related videos.¹¹³⁴

False positives

In February 2019, automated filters accidentally flagged several channels with videos discussing the AR mobile game Pokémon Go and the massively multiplayer online game Club Penguin for containing prohibited sexual content, as some of their videos contained references to "CP" in their title. In Unkamen Go, "CP" is an abbreviation of "Combat Power" — a level system in the game, and "CP" is an abbreviation of Club Penguin, but it was believed that YouTube's filters had accidentally interpreted it as referring to child pornography. The affected channels were restored, and YouTube apologized for the inconvenience.^{1135,1136}

In August 2019, YouTube mistakenly took down robot fighting videos for violating its policies against animal cruelty.¹¹³⁷

In December 2019, YouTube abruptly taken down videos related to cryptocurrency citing them as "harmful or dangerous content" and "sale of regulated goods".^{1138,1139} Days later, videos were restored by YouTube because it was an error.^{1140,1141}

2007 anti-censorship shareholder initiative

On May 10, 2007, shareholders of Google voted down an anti-censorship proposal for the company. The text of the failed proposal submitted by the New York City comptroller's office (which controls a significant number of shares on behalf of retirement funds) stated that:

1. Data that can identify individual users should not be hosted in Internet-restricting countries, where political speech can be treated as a crime by the legal system.
2. The company will not engage in pro-active censorship.
3. The company will use all legal means to resist demands for censorship. The company will only comply with such demands if required to do so through legally binding procedures.
4. Users will be clearly informed when the company has acceded to legally binding government requests to filter or otherwise censor content that the user is trying to access.
5. Users should be informed about the company's data retention practices, and the ways in which their data is shared with third parties.
6. The company will document all cases where legally binding censorship requests have been complied with, and that information will be publicly available.

David Drummond, senior vice president for corporate development, said "Pulling out of China, shutting down Google.cn, is just not the right thing to do at this point... but that's exactly what this proposal would do."¹¹²¹

CEO Eric Schmidt and founders Larry Page and Sergey Brin recommended that shareholders vote against the proposal. Together they hold 66.2 percent of Google's total shareholder voting power, meaning that they could themselves have declined the anti-censorship proposal.¹¹²²

In today's twisted world, threatening to kill ICE agents is ruled "protected speech" while questioning vaccine safety gets you banned and attacked

12/26/2019 / By [Ethan Huff](#)



A 35-year-old Massachusetts man who, based on [his picture](#), appears to be a little light in the loafers has been [acquitted by a jury](#) after offering a \$500 bounty on Twitter to anyone willing to murder an Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) agent.

Brandon Ziobrowski of Cambridge had reportedly posted an announcement on his social media account encouraging his followers to take the life of an ICE agent in exchange for cash – a clear and present threat that a local jury ultimately determined to be "protected speech" under the First Amendment.

Even as social media companies like Facebook [aggressively de-platform](#) users for posting truthful information about vaccines that goes against the official government narrative, Ziobrowski was given a free pass to continue running his mouth online – could it be because he's a member of a [protected societal class](#)?

We won't speculate any further on that angle, but one thing is for sure: Ziobrowski obviously hates federal law enforcement officials who are tasked with addressing illegal immigration. As a typical American liberal, Ziobrowski presumably believes that "no human is illegal" – except for humans who work at ICE, however, whom he believes should be extinguished.

"It seemed like the right verdict," Ziobrowski is quoted as saying as he walked out of the court room completely vindicated for making these online threats. "It's been a horrible year. I'm glad it's over."

Had Ziobrowski been convicted of using interstate and foreign commerce to transmit a threat, he could have ended up in prison for up to five years, as well as forced to pay a \$250,000 fine. But because it's now "[politically correct](#)" to wish for the death of ICE agents, Ziobrowski was set free.

"We respect the jury's verdict. But in this case, the defendant posted a tweet that, on its face, offered \$500 to anyone who killed a federal agent," stated U.S. Attorney Andrew Lelling in a follow-up statement to the decision.

"In 2019, over 100 law enforcement officers died in the line of duty. The public needs to know that, regardless of today's verdict, we will never hesitate to prosecute threats against law enforcement officers."

Keep in mind that Ziobrowski's offending tweet wasn't an isolated incident. The guy has reportedly tweeted and shared all sorts of offensive content on social media that, were Ziobrowski a conservative, would have at the very least warranted him being shadow-banned or removed from social media entirely, if not prosecuted and actually sent to prison for "hate speech."

We don't know about you, but we think offering money in exchange for murder is about as hateful as it gets. And yet it's not the right *kind* of hate as to warrant the same type of punishment that 30-year-old Adolfo Martínez from Ames, Iowa, received after he was convicted of – *gasp!* – stealing an LGBTQ “rainbow” flag from a local “church” and burning it.

Martínez received a whopping 16 years in prison for this “hate crime,” even though nobody and nothing was harmed besides the cheap made-in-China piece of cloth. Meanwhile, Ziobrowski offers to pay off a bounty hunter, essentially, and is let off the hook completely because the leftist jury in his case apparently loves homosexuals and hates ICE – meaning Ziobrowski's hate is the “acceptable” kind.

“What would happen if someone tweeted an offer to have him deleted?” asked one *Fox News* commenter about a scenario in which the tables were turned.

“This is considered free speech? Then what about the Confederate monuments,” asked another.

“To threaten someone is acceptable but to be offended or to be perceived to be called a name is bigoted and hateful? There is no way to logically reason with these people because logic does not exist in their mind.”

Sources for this article include:

[FoxNews.com](https://www.foxnews.com)

[NaturalNews.com](https://www.naturalnews.com)

[NaturalNews.com](https://www.naturalnews.com)

Why is Twitter Censoring Free Speech?

February 10, 2017 By [Aaron](#)

<https://freedomandfulfillment.com/twitter-censorship-free-speech/>

There has been a disturbing trend of increasing censorship against free speech on Twitter. This comes not from radicals or extremists on the platform but from Twitter itself. Needless to say the increased Twitter censorship is unsettling.

Twitter's new safety policies

On Tuesday Twitter Safety made an announcement about new policies rolling out in the coming weeks.

"We stand for freedom of expression and people being able to see all sides of any topic. That's put in jeopardy when abuse and harassment stifle and silence those voices. We won't tolerate it and we're launching new efforts to stop it."

This makes no sense, as users on an egalitarian platform don't have the capacity to "stifle and silence" one another. Everyone stands on equal ground. The only actor with the power to silence users is Twitter themselves, and that is, seemingly, exactly what they are doing.

"Today, we're announcing three changes: stopping the creation of new abusive accounts, bringing forward safer search results, and collapsing potentially abusive or low-quality Tweets."

More vagueness and Orwellian doublespeak. People's concern here is that this is not about safety or protecting the integrity of the platform, but rather Twitter pushing its own ideological agenda.

The problem with censorship

The problem with censorship is always the same: **who gets to decide?**

Who gets to decide what's acceptable and what's to be censored? Who gets to decide what constitutes "abuse"? Who gets to decide when a search result is too "unsafe" or "sensitive" for you to see?

Others are calling attention to this issue. Click the tweet below to read the replies of Twitter users themselves.

David Icke is horribly wrong about the coronavirus, but I support his right to speak... DAMN the tech giants for deleting his channels (and mine)

05/07/2020 / By [Mike Adams](#)



David Icke has been de-platformed by YouTube and Facebook for promoting his theories about the coronavirus, according to [The Guardian](#). His theories — which pretend there is no coronavirus — are absurd and wildly misinformed, but that's beside the point. Facebook and YouTube have de-platformed David Icke, essentially claiming his lack of obedience to the W.H.O. is a danger to the public.

While I strongly disagree with David Icke's pandemic denialism — which I have publicly criticized — I strongly agree with his right to speak.

More importantly, if Google and Facebook can ban David Icke today for not bowing down to the WHO, they can ban YOU tomorrow for having "divergent" ideas that aren't condoned by the corrupt, fraudulent establishment.

As [John Whitehead of the Rutherford Institute](#) explains:

In the long run, this "safety" control (the censorship and shadowbanning of anyone who challenges a mainstream narrative) will be far worse than merely allowing people to think for themselves.

Journalist Matt Taibbi gets it: "The people who want to add a censorship regime to a health crisis are more dangerous and more stupid by leaps and bounds than a president who tells people to inject disinfectant."

These internet censors are not acting in our best interests to protect us from dangerous, disinformation campaigns about COVID-19, a virus whose source and behavior continue to elude medical officials. They're laying the groundwork now, with Icke as an easy target, to preempt any "dangerous" ideas that might challenge the power elite's stranglehold over our lives.

This is how freedom dies..

Where we stand now is at the juncture of OldSpeak (where words have meanings, and ideas can be dangerous) and NewSpeak (where only that which is "safe" and "accepted" by the majority is permitted). The power elite has made their intentions clear: they will pursue and prosecute any and all words, thoughts and expressions that challenge their authority.

The real danger to our society isn't David Icke. It's Google. YouTube. Facebook. And Twitter.

In fact, this incident underscores my repeated call for President Trump to **arrest the CEOs of Google, Twitter and Facebook** and charge them with crimes against the United States of America for violating the First Amendment rights of countless millions of people.

Google's evil censorship and de-platforming of independent voices is a grave danger to our society and **isn't compatible with a free country**. America can never be free as long as Google and other techno-fascist platforms of extreme censorship continue to exist.

And if President Trump and the DOJ won't take action against Google and the evil tech giants, it's going to come down to We the People peacefully assembling by the millions, marching to occupy the data centers of the tech giants and **peacefully disassembling their infrastructure of tyranny**. One motherboard at a time, if necessary.

Google must be dismantled. Twitter must be ended. Facebook must be vanquished from our world. For humanity to be set free, **the techno fascists must be permanently abolished**. And those criminal-minded, power-hungry techno-fascists who run them should be charged and prosecuted for heinous crimes against humanity. Public tribunals should be held so that these malicious criminals are held to answer for their crimes against us all.

For the real enemies of humanity aren't people like David Icke, nor even myself (I've also been permanently banned everywhere for using laboratory science to document the presence of

mercury in vaccines, among other things). The real danger to humanity is the tech giants themselves.



I would much rather live in a world of David Icke than a world full of Zuckerbergs or Dorseys. Icke may not yet have his facts straight on the coronavirus, but **he's not an evil, villainous enemy of humanity** like Jack Dorsey and Sundar Pichai.

David Icke doesn't want to lock you down and control your mind. His goal is to **free your mind** and provoke you to start questioning everything. While his conclusions may be wrong on the coronavirus, his *process* of creative thinking and cognitive liberty is essential for human freedom to prosper.

It's time to take down the evil. As I said yesterday, End the LOCKDOWNS and Launch the TAKEDOWNS.

And Sir David Icke, you are welcome to post on my video platform any time you'd like, even if we disagree on the nature and causes of covid-19.

Here are the top 10 most outrageous censorship stories of 2019

12/26/2019 / By JD Hayes

<https://youtubecensorship.com/2019-12-26-top-10-most-outrageous-censorship-stories-of-2019.html>



The Left-wing establishment media took a big step this year in becoming 'official state-run media,' completely throwing in with the Democrat Party and going all-out to attack and trash President Donald Trump and his supporters.

But when the corporate-run media outlets weren't defiling Trump's reputation with lies fed to them by the deep state, they were doing their best to propagandize against truth on many levels and with various subjects.

Mostly, that involved censoring facts through acts of omission.

With that, and after careful review, we bring you 10 of the most egregious and outrageous examples of censorship and lying of the past year.

1. Google to begin blocking all anti-cancer, 'anti-vax,' and anti-GMO websites

As exclusively reported by *Natural News*' founder and editor Mike Adams in July, search behemoth Google will begin blocking *all* websites that publish truth about alternative cancer treatments, the dangers behind vaccines, and disturbing health facts related to GMO foods.

Because we can't have free exchanges of ideas and information when such exchanges disrupt the status quo with facts the healthcare industry doesn't want you to know.

2. Google declares supplements and organics to be a 'lie' and a 'scam'

Google struck a blow against health facts and truth again over the summer when it began "censoring all content about organics, homeopathy, naturopathy, chiropractic, herbs, nutrition and supplements." Adams reported, citing an analysis of data from Sanyer Ji, founder of GreenMedInfo.

3. Facebook also pledged to block ALL posts questioning the deadly vaccine industry

At the request of House Intelligence Committee chairman and lead Trump impeachment hoaxter Adam Schiff (D-Calif.), Facebook announced in February it would soon begin censoring any content that questions the establishment healthcare industry's dogma that 'all vaccines are safe and effective.'

So much for that First Amendment thingy

4. Amazon prefers satanism over any films that are critical of the vaccine industry

Yes, the e-tailer giant also got into the censorship act this past year when officials declared they banned the sale of anti-vaccine documentaries based on sound science and replicable data, while still allowing people to publish and sell books on "Satanism" — in particular, satanic books that focus on teenagers.

That Jeff Bezos... what a guy. It's almost as though he wants to oversee the destruction of truth and the free exchange of ideas while promoting tyranny and authoritarianism. And censorship.

And this guy owns the Washington Post.

5. Twitter blocked Natural News and the Health Ranger

After Adams, the Health Ranger appeared on the Alex Jones Show to discuss the truth about Twitter founder Jack Dorsey's "criminal fronting for Bitcoin and deep state money laundering." lo and behold he found his channel and those belonging to Natural News blocked, and without explanation.

Dorsey was pushing a Lightning Labs project that was, at the time, working to push a new protocol into Bitcoin, but he didn't discuss it on the air with host Joe Rogan — who never asked the Twitter CEO about that massive conflict of interest.

6. Did the Trump administration send a warning to Big Tech?

In June, Adams reported that shortly after the Trump White House announced a Justice Department anti-trust probe into Google, "dozens of tech companies have been disrupted via sweeping internet outages that many are calling the 'internet kill switch.'"

The reason for the investigation was the continued censorship by the Big Tech giants of conservative, pro-Trump websites and news organizations. Maybe the 'kill switch' was the administration's way of saying, 'Stop messing with us or we'll put you out of business,' Adams intimated.

7. Facebook banned Natural News

Around the same time of the 'kill switch' incident, Facebook permanently banned Natural News from posting any content following "a coordinated, heavily-funded smear campaign against" the news site and its founder, Adams. "This is on top of permanent bans of Natural News content from Twitter, YouTube, Pinterest, Google News, Apple, and other techno-fascists that now represent" a massive threat to human freedom.

8. Apple threatened permanent banning as well

Earlier, in February, Apple demanded that Natural News stop publishing factual news and information pertaining to the abortion industry and Satanism, or the Big Tech giant would block Natural News from all Apple devices.

"With Democrats now openly pushing infanticide and the legalization of the serial killing of infants, tech giants like Apple are serving as the censorship "speech police" to silence all criticism of the gruesome practice," Adams wrote.

9. Microsoft gets in on the censorship too

In January, Microsoft unveiled plans to partner with NewsGuard, a startup that aims to censor much of what appears on the internet that does not comply with Left-wing establishment and globalist agendas. Labeling 'dissent' as "fake news," Microsoft's effort is nothing more than blatant censorship.

EXECUTIVE ORDER

PREVENTING ONLINE CENSORSHIP

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1: Policy. Free speech is the bedrock of American democracy. Our Founding Fathers protected this sacred right with the First Amendment to the Constitution. The freedom to express and debate ideas is the foundation for all of our rights as a free people.

In a country that has long cherished the freedom of expression, we cannot allow a limited number of online platforms to hand pick the speech that Americans may access and convey on the internet. This practice is fundamentally un-American and anti-democratic. When large, powerful social media companies censor opinions with which they disagree, they exercise a dangerous power. They cease functioning as passive bulletin boards, and ought to be viewed and treated as content creators.

The growth of online platforms in recent years raises important questions about applying the ideals of the First Amendment to modern communications technology. Today, many Americans follow the news, stay in touch with friends and family, and share their views on current events through social media and other online platforms. As a result, these platforms function in many ways as a 21st century equivalent of the public square.

Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, and YouTube wield immense, if not unprecedented, power to shape the interpretation of public events; to censor, delete, or disappear information; and to control what people see or do not see.

As President, I have made clear my commitment to free and open debate on the internet. Such debate is just as important online as it is in our universities, our town halls, and our homes. It is essential to sustaining our democracy.

Online platforms are engaging in selective censorship that is harming our national discourse. Tens of thousands of Americans have reported, among other troubling behaviors, online platforms "flagging" content as inappropriate, even though it does not violate any stated terms of service; making unannounced and unexplained changes to company policies that have the effect of disfavoring certain viewpoints; and deleting content and entire accounts with no warning, no rationale, and no recourse.

Twitter now selectively decides to place a warning label on certain tweets in a manner that clearly reflects political bias. As has been reported, Twitter seems never to have placed such a label on another politician's tweet. As recently as last week, Representative Adam Schiff was continuing to mislead his followers by peddling the long-disproved Russian Collusion Hoax, and Twitter did not flag those tweets. Unsurprisingly, its officer in charge of so-called "Site Integrity" has flaunted his political bias in his own tweets.

At the same time online platforms are invoking inconsistent, irrational, and groundless justifications to censor or otherwise restrict Americans' speech here at home, several online platforms are profiting from and promoting the aggression and disinformation spread by foreign governments like China. One United States company, for example, created a search engine for the Chinese Communist Party that would have blacklisted searches for "human rights," hid data unfavorable to the Chinese Communist Party, and tracked users determined appropriate for surveillance. It also established research partnerships in China that provide direct benefits to the Chinese military. Other companies have accepted advertisements paid for by the Chinese government that spread false information about China's mass imprisonment of religious minorities, thereby enabling these abuses of human rights. They have also amplified China's propaganda abroad, including by allowing Chinese

government officials to use their platforms to spread misinformation regarding the origins of the COVID-19 pandemic, and to undermine pro-democracy protests in Hong Kong.

As a Nation, we must foster and protect diverse viewpoints in today's digital communications environment where all Americans can and should have a voice. We must seek transparency and accountability from online platforms, and encourage standards and tools to protect and preserve the integrity and openness of American discourse and freedom of expression.

Sec. 2. Protections Against Online Censorship. (a) It is the policy of the United States to foster clear ground rules promoting free and open debate on the internet. Prominent among the ground rules governing that debate is the immunity from liability created by section 230(e) of the Communications Decency Act (section 230(e)), 47 U.S.C. 230(e). It is the policy of the United States that the scope of that immunity should be clarified: the immunity should not extend beyond its text and purpose to provide protection for those who purport to provide users a forum (i) free and open speech, but in reality use their power over a vital means of communication to engage in deceptive or pretextual actions stifling free and open debate by censoring certain viewpoints.

Section 230(e) was designed to address early court decisions holding that, if an online platform restricted access to some content posted by others, it would thereby become a "publisher" of all the content posted on its site for purposes of torts such as defamation. As the title of section 230(e) makes clear, the provision provides limited liability "protection" to a provider of an interactive computer service (such as an online platform) that engages in "Good Samaritan" blocking of harmful content. In particular, the Congress sought to provide protections for online platforms that attempted to protect minors from harmful content and intended to ensure that such providers would not be discouraged from taking down harmful material. The provision was also intended to further the express vision of the Congress that the internet is a "forum for a true diversity of political discourse." 47 U.S.C. 230(a)(3). The limited protections provided by the statute should be construed with these purposes in mind.

In particular, subparagraph (e)(2) expressly addresses protections from "civil liability" and specifies that an interactive computer service provider may not be made liable "on account of" its decision in "good faith" to restrict access to content that it considers to be "obscene, lewd, lascivious, filthy, excessively violent, harassing or otherwise objectionable." It is the policy of the United States to ensure that, to the maximum extent permissible under the law, this provision is not distorted to provide liability protection for online platforms that – far from acting in "good faith" to remove objectionable content – instead engage in deceptive or pretextual actions (often contrary to their stated terms of service) to stifle viewpoints with which they disagree. Section 230 was not intended to allow a handful of companies to grow into titans controlling vital avenues for our national discourse under the guise of promoting open forums for debate, and then to provide those behemoths blanket immunity when they use their power to censor content and silence viewpoints that they dislike. When an interactive computer service provider removes or restricts access to content and its actions do not meet the criteria of subparagraph (e)(2)(A), it is engaged in editorial conduct. It is the policy of the United States that such a provider should properly lose the limited liability shield of subparagraph (e)(2)(A) and be exposed to liability like any traditional editor and publisher that is not an online provider.

(b) To advance the policy described in subsection (a) of this section, all executive departments and agencies should ensure that their application of section 230(e) properly reflects the narrow purpose of the section and take all appropriate actions in this regard. In addition, within 60 days of the date of this order, the Secretary of Commerce (Secretary), in consultation with the Attorney General, and acting through the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), shall file a petition for rulemaking with the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) requesting that the FCC expeditiously propose regulations to clarify:

EXECUTIVE ORDER

(i) the interaction between subparagraphs (c)(1) and (c)(2) of section 230, in particular to clarify and the circumstances under which a provider of an interactive computer service that restricts access to content in a manner not specifically protected by subparagraph (c)(1), which merely states that a provider shall not be treated as a publisher or speaker making third-party content available and does not address the provider's responsibility for its own editorial decisions;

(ii) the conditions under which an action restricting access to or availability of material is not "taken in good faith" within the meaning of subparagraph (c)(2)(A) of section 230, particularly whether actions can be "taken in good faith" if they are:

- (A) deceptive, pretextual, or inconsistent with a provider's terms of service; or
- (B) taken after failing to provide adequate notice, reasoned explanation, or a meaningful opportunity to be heard; and

(iii) any other proposed regulations that the NTIA concludes may be appropriate to advance the policy described in subsection (a) of this section.

Sec. 3. Protecting Federal Taxpayer Dollars from Financing Online Platforms That Restrict Free Speech. (a) The head of each executive department and agency (agency) shall review its agency's Federal spending on advertising and marketing paid to online platforms. Such review shall include the amount of money spent on online platforms that receive Federal dollars, and the statutory authorities available to restrict their receipt of advertising dollars.

(b) Within 30 days of the date of this order, the head of each agency shall report its findings to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(c) The Department of Justice shall review the viewpoint-based speech restrictions imposed by each online platform identified in the report described in subsection (b) of this section and assess whether any such platforms are problematic vehicles for government speech due to viewpoint discrimination, deception of consumers, or other bad practices.

Sec. 4. Federal Review of Unfair or Deceptive Acts or Practices. (a) It is the policy of the United States and ideas today, should not restrict protected speech. The Supreme Court has noted that social media sites and ideas today, should not restrict protected speech. The Supreme Court has noted that social media sites make his or her voice heard." Packingham v. North Carolina, 137 S. Ct. 1730, 1737 (2017). Communication through these channels has become important for meaningful participation in American democracy, including petition elected leaders. These sites are providing an important forum to the public for others to engage expression and debate. Cf. Prune Yard Shopping Center v. Robins, 447 U.S. 74, 85-89 (1980).

(b) In May of 2019, the White House launched a Tech Bias Reporting tool to allow Americans to report incidents of online censorship. In just weeks, the White House received over 16,000 complaints from platforms censoring or otherwise taking action against users based on their political viewpoints. The White House will submit such complaints received to the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission (FTC).

(c) The FTC shall consider taking action, as appropriate and consistent with applicable law, to prohibit deceptive acts or practices in or affecting commerce, pursuant to section 45 of title 15, United States Code. Such unfair or deceptive acts or practices may include practices by entities covered by section 230 that do not align with those entities' public representations about those practices.

TI
LS
pe
off
At
or o
the i
exam
Thum
appuy
Chinese
spread
abuses



(i) the interaction between subparagraphs (c)(1) and (c)(2) of section 230, in particular to clarify and determine the circumstances under which a provider of an interactive computer service that restricts access to content in a manner not specifically protected by subparagraph (c)(2)(A) may also not be able to claim protection under subparagraph (c)(1), which merely states that a provider shall not be treated as a publisher or speaker for making third-party content available and does not address the provider's responsibility for its own editorial decisions;

(ii) the conditions under which an action restricting access to or availability of material is not "taken in good faith" within the meaning of subparagraph (c)(2)(A) of section 230, particularly whether actions can be "taken in good faith" if they are:

(A) deceptive, pretextual, or inconsistent with a provider's terms of service; or

(B) taken after failing to provide adequate notice, reasoned explanation, or a meaningful opportunity to be heard; and

(iii) any other proposed regulations that the NTIA concludes may be appropriate to advance the policy described in subsection (a) of this section.

Sec. 3. Protecting Federal Taxpayer Dollars from Financing Online Platforms That Restrict Free Speech. (a) The head of each executive department and agency (agency) shall review its agency's Federal spending on advertising and marketing paid to online platforms. Such review shall include the amount of money spent, the online platforms that receive Federal dollars, and the statutory authorities available to restrict their receipt of advertising dollars.

(b) Within 30 days of the date of this order, the head of each agency shall report its findings to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(c) The Department of Justice shall review the viewpoint-based speech restrictions imposed by each online platform identified in the report described in subsection (b) of this section and assess whether any online platforms are problematic vehicles for government speech due to viewpoint discrimination, deception to consumers, or other bad practices.

Sec. 4. Federal Review of Unfair or Deceptive Acts or Practices. (a) It is the policy of the United States that large online platforms, such as Twitter and Facebook, as the critical means of promoting the free flow of speech and ideas today, should not restrict protected speech. The Supreme Court has noted that social media sites, as the modern public square, "can provide perhaps the most powerful mechanisms available to a private citizen to make his or her voice heard." *Packingham v. North Carolina*, 137 S. Ct. 1730, 1737 (2017). Communication through these channels has become important for meaningful participation in American democracy, including to petition elected leaders. These sites are providing an important forum to the public for others to engage in free expression and debate. Cf. *Prune Yard Shopping Center v. Robins*, 447 U.S. 74, 85-89 (1980).

(b) In May of 2019, the White House launched a Tech Bias Reporting tool to allow Americans to report incidents of online censorship. In just weeks, the White House received over 16,000 complaints of online platforms censoring or otherwise taking action against users based on their political viewpoints. The White House will submit such complaints received to the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission (FTC).

(c) The FTC shall consider taking action, as appropriate and consistent with applicable law, to prohibit unfair or deceptive acts or practices in or affecting commerce, pursuant to section 45 of title 15, United States Code. Such unfair or deceptive acts or practice may include practices by entities covered by section 230 that restrict speech in ways that do not align with those entities' public representations about those practices.

(d) The Commission shall, consistent with its legal authority, consider whether complaints allege violations of law that are consistent with the principles set forth in section 4(a) of this order. The FTC shall consider developing a report by such complaints and making the report publicly available, consistent with applicable law.

Sec. 5. State Review of Unfair or Deceptive Acts or Practices and Anti-Discrimination Laws. (a) The Attorney General shall establish a working group regarding the potential enforcement of State statutes that prohibit online platforms from engaging in unfair or deceptive acts or practices. The working group shall also develop model legislation for consideration by legislatures in States where existing statutes do not protect Americans from such unfair and deceptive acts and practices. The working group shall invite State Attorneys General for discussion and consultation, as appropriate and consistent with applicable law.

(b) Complaints described in section 4(b) of this order will be shared with the working group, consistent with applicable law. The working group shall also collect publicly available information regarding the following:

- (i) increased scrutiny of users based on the other users they choose to follow, or their interactions with other users;
- (ii) algorithms to suppress content or users based on indications of political alignment or viewpoint;
- (iii) differential policies allowing for otherwise impermissible behavior, when committed by accounts associated with the Chinese Communist Party or other anti-democratic associations or governments;
- (iv) reliance on third-party entities, including contractors, media organizations, and individuals, with indicia of bias to review content; and
- (v) acts that limit the ability of users with particular viewpoints to earn money on the platform compared with other users similarly situated.

Sec. 6. Legislation. The Attorney General shall develop a proposal for Federal legislation that would be useful to promote the policy objectives of this order.

Sec. 7. Definition. For purposes of this order, the term "online platform" means any website or application that allows users to create and share content or engage in social networking, or any general search engine.

Sec. 8. General Provisions. (a) Nothing in this order shall be construed to impair or otherwise affect:

- (i) the authority granted by law to an executive department or agency, or the head thereof; or
- (ii) the functions of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget relating to budgetary, administrative, or legislative proposals;
- (h) this order shall be implemented consistent with applicable law and subject to the availability of appropriations.
- (c) This order is not intended to, and does not, create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or in equity by any party against the United States, its departments, agencies, or entities, its officers, employees, or agents, or any other person.

DONALD J. TRUMP

THE WHITE HOUSE

May 28, 2020

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE INDEX# 2020-507

New York State }
Dutchess County } ss:

I, James Vidurek, being duly sworn, deposes and says: I am over 18 years of age and on the 18th day of June, 2020 I served the following papers:

- Summons
- Action at law

Upon the following whose names and addresses is set forth below, by depositing a true copy in the United States Post Office thereby mailing said document to the respective offices, addresses listed below:

- Alphabet Inc., 1600 Amphitheatre Pkwy, Mountain View, CA 94043
- Youtube, Google LLC, D/B/A YouTube, 901 Cherry Ave., San Bruno, CA 94066
- Google, 1600 Amphitheatre Pkway., Mountain View, CA 94043
- Facebook, 1 Hacker Way, Menlo Park, CA 94025
- Twitter, Inc., 1355 Market Street Suite 900, San Francisco, CA 9410


DUTCHESS COUNTY
CLERK'S OFFICE
RECEIVED
2020 JUN 22 AM 9:33

James Vidurek

NOTARY

New York State, Dutchess County on this 18th day of June, 2020 before me, the subscriber, personally appeared James Vidurek to me known to be the living (wo)man describe in and who executed the forgoing instrument and sworn before me that he executed the same as his/her free will act and deed.

(Notary Seal)



Alaina Watson

Notary