

THE CENSORSHIP MASTER PLAN DECODED

(i.e. “The Adams Report”)

**The blueprint for how tech giants covertly silence online speech, and
how America can fight back against corporate tech monopolists**

By Mike Adams, founder, NaturalNews.com, Censored.news, REAL.video, Counterthink.com, Naturalpedia.com and 300+ more websites, fill-in host for Alex Jones of InfoWars.com, peer-reviewed science paper author, radiation protection patent holder (“Cesium Eliminator”), mass spec laboratory founder (CWClabs.com), science book author (“Food Forensics”) and award-winning investigative journalist

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Part One: The Societal Cost of Censorship and the Denial of the Right to Exist	4
Part Two: The Fight for Reality (censorship motivations and justifications)	15
Part Three: The Fallacy of “Fake News”	24
Part Four: Decentralization and the Structure of News Consumption	36
Part Five: Technological and Psychological Methods of Overt and Covert Censorship.....	42
Part Six: Legislative and Regulatory Solutions to Techno-Tyranny.....	53
About the Author.....	59

This document is provided under a Creative Commons license and may be cited in whole or in part, with credit to the author and a link to the source.

ADDITIONS AND ERRATA: This document may be updated with additional graphics, corrections, links or updates. The permanent URL for this document in PDF form is:

<http://www.NaturalNews.com/Files/Censorship-Master-Plan-Decoded.pdf>

Introduction

To date, no one has assembled a comprehensive compendium of the aggressive censorship strategies and mechanisms now being deployed against users being targeted by the tech giants. This document aims to serve as a primer “blueprint” to explain both the motivations behind the extreme censorship as well as the technical / mechanical means through which such censorship is carried out.

This document should be required reading for any lawmaker, regulator or judicial decision maker interested in protecting the freedom of speech that has served as a critical pillar in our society for over two centuries.

Today’s attacks on the First Amendment are being carried out by a “triple threat” tag-team of institutions:

#1) Tech giants - Their role is to carry out the mechanics of censorship, shadow banning, “doubt interruptions” and other techniques described in this report.

#2) Establishment media - Tasked with promoting the lynch mob mentality of hysteria and hatred which is translated into widespread calls for silencing whatever voices they don’t like: CNN’s insistent demand for InfoWars to be deplatformed from Facebook, for example.

#3) Third party fact-checkers and moderators - These groups, such as the SPLC, Politifact, etc., are given the task of flagging all undesirable political speech (or even speech about natural health, as you’ll see below) as “hate speech,” creating the justification for tech giants to ban or deplatform such accounts without having to accept internal organizational responsibility for discriminating against selected targeted.

These three “fronts” conspire to attack, defame and deplatform originators of certain types of speech (such as conservative speech, pro-Trump speech, natural health speech, pro-cannabis legalization speech, etc.). Traditionally, watchdogs such as the ACLU would strongly

speak out against such egregious violations of civil liberties, yet the ACLU, being strongly affiliated with the politics of the Left, has consciously stood by and watched this “free speech massacre” take place, saying nothing in dissent.

While the books are burning, in other words, the ACLU is roasting marshmallows by the fire. (And the EFF is looking around for more chocolate bars.)

Thus, we are now faced with a kind of perfect storm in America—a “free speech apocalypse”—where all the institutions that once called for protections of the freedom of expression are now actively conspiring to exterminate it. This coordinated attack on free speech is now taking place in plain view. The agenda is not hidden, nor is it even debatable that this is taking place. The goal is the complete abolition of all speech that left-leaning tech giants wish to eliminate, and these efforts have been deliberately accelerated as the 2018 mid-term elections approach, carrying out what can only be called an extreme example of election interference and a plot to defraud the United States of America by silencing the voices of those who embody conservative philosophies.

What Robert Mueller accused the Russians of doing—interfering with U.S. elections—is actually being carried out right now by tech giants, the establishment media and third-party “fact-checkers.”

Google, Facebook, YouTube, CNN and even the ACLU are all conspiring to defraud the United States of America by silencing conservative voices, en masse, in the run up to a critical election that may decide the fate of our nation.

The United States Congress must act. New laws must be passed and enforced that invoke the authority of the federal government to prevent dominant online platforms from engaging in the many forms of overt and covert censorship described herein. To write effective

laws that protect free speech, lawmakers must understand the technical mechanics of how censorship is accomplished. That's the point of this document: To describe the mechanics of censorship as well as presenting thoughtful intellectual arguments that oppose the consolidation of "speech authority" in the hands of power-hungry tech giants, many of which are owned and run by individuals whose own politics reflect deeply-ingrained hatred toward America's founding principles.

If we are to survive as a constitutional Republic, the protection of online speech must now be pursued with a sense of urgency, or we will soon find ourselves living in a hyper-connected online society where only one "official" opinion is allowed on any given topic... and that single allowable opinion is likely to be rooted in irrationality, falsehoods or popular delusions, such as the absurd idea that a biological man can magically transform into a woman, then compete against women in professional sports even while possessing the genetics, musculature and sports performance of a male athlete. This very idea, which is obviously an affront to real women, has been so thoroughly embraced by the political Left that any who oppose it are immediately flagged for "hate speech."

Read this document in full. Forward it to your representatives in Washington D.C. Urge lawmakers and our President to act on this now, or we will lose not just our freedom to speak, but our right to meaningfully participate in the dominant public space platforms through which social and professional interactions now take place.

The author of this report, Mike Adams, is available to brief members of Congress or Trump administration staff members with further details and analysis. Adams is located near Austin, Texas. See further bio details at the end of this report.

Part One: The Societal Cost of Censorship and the Denial of the Right to Exist

Censorship by tech giants is an assault on the right to exist in an online-dominated society

The predominant argument of pro-censorship advocates largely consists of claiming that because Google, Facebook, etc., are private corporations, they can therefore engage in discriminatory censorship of any kind they wish, without restraint or regulatory oversight. This argument collapses when seen in the context of the broad recognition that participation in dominant online platforms has become essential for personal, social and professional interactions in the modern world.

Just as citizens of fifty years ago could not meaningfully participate in society without phone or electricity service, today's citizens cannot meaningfully participate in the modern world without an online presence, expressed through the dominant online communications platforms such as Facebook, Google, Twitter and YouTube.

Dominant online platforms have become essential services for meaningful participation in modern society.

This is further underscored by the fact that an individual's online presence exerts forceful and lasting influence on their personal and social life, professional life, career opportunities

and freedom of expression, including the freedom to engage in political debate that may influence others in elections. To be shadow banned by Facebook or YouTube today is as destructive to an individual's quality of life as being surreptitiously cut off from phone and electricity services in the 1970s, for example, or even denied the right to walk down a public sidewalk and chat with neighbors.

Facebook is, in essence, the “public square” of modern life, with other adjunct services such as Twitter and YouTube serving similar social interaction functions.

Yet no reasonable person would argue today that electricity companies, even though they are private corporations, should have to right to cut off electricity from targeted customers because the company disagrees with their politics. Similarly, internet service providers (ISPs) don't cut off customers who use their services, even when those services are conduits for forms of expression with which the ISP may vehemently disagree.

Yet according to the distorted justification of the political Left in America today, all private companies have the inherent right to refuse essential services to selected customers merely because they disagree with the political views of those customers. By this thinking, banks should refuse to lend money to Trump supporters. Housing builders should refuse to sell homes to conservatives. Gasoline stations should carry signs that read, “Conservatives not allowed to buy gas.” Even iPhone retailers, we're told, should refuse to sell iPhones to customers who are Trump supporters, because they might use those iPhones to post pro-Trump comments that “offend” those who oppose Trump.

There was a time in America where one specific group of people was told to sit at the back of the bus. Certain cafes were reserved for “whites only,” and people were judged and punished based on the color of their skin. Online censorship by tech giants now judges people based on the color of their thoughts, and conservatives, Trump supporters and advocates of natural health content (see below) are overtly told, “We don't serve your kind here,” an obvious throwback to the era of discrimination and intolerance that Americans have roundly rejected. (Amazingly, this overt discrimination is being carried out by the very people who proclaim themselves to be “tolerant” and “inclusive.”)

In a society that has roundly rejected the idea that private businesses can discriminate against people based on the color of their skin, established media giants are openly demanding that private businesses now discriminate against people based on the color of their ideas.

Because of the online nature of modern online, the censorship of individuals on the dominant online platforms of open expression is an attack on their very right to participate in society. No modern person can meaningfully participate in modern social and professional interactions without an online presence on one or more social media giants. They have become “essential services” for modern life, making them just as critical to modern survival as electricity, housing or phone service.

Many on the political Left attempt to conflate these issues by citing the recent U.S. Supreme Court decision which concluded that a Christian baker in Colorado could not be compelled by the state to engage in artistic expression (decorating a cake) that violated his private religious convictions. According to Leftists who are increasingly devoid of logic and reason, this proves that private corporations can ban speech they don't like. Yet the Christian baker (Jack Phillips) is not the Google of cake baking in the world and clearly does not control 90% of the cake decorating business in America. Gay customers were free to rather easily find a vast assortment of other cake shops that would gladly decorate the cake, and they did not need to violate someone's religious beliefs in order to achieve that goal. Finally, Jack Phillips' cake shop is not an essential public forum for modern society, quite obviously, and his refusal to engage in artistic expression against his wishes in no way harmed the gay customers beyond the mere inconvenience of walking down the street to another gay-friendly cake shop and engaging in a business transaction there.

The central deception of tech giants

The tech giants now discriminating against individuals based on the color of their ideas—companies like Google, Facebook, YouTube and Twitter—have all pursued a central deception that has only now been exposed.

That deception consists of these companies launching under the false pretense of being “open platforms” that welcomed free speech from nearly anyone. None of these platforms launched with an honest warning that stated, for example, “Warning to conservatives: Your kind aren’t welcomed here.”

Because of this central deception, platforms like Facebook rapidly expanded as individuals who had channels there promoted the Facebook platform to their own friends, family members and professional contacts. This allowed Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, etc., to rapidly expand and become the dominant platforms of online expression and social interaction.

Once their dominant market position was achieved, they then started banning individuals based on the content of their ideas, deeply violating the original promise and pretense of the online service. In other words, only after conservatives helped Facebook become the dominant social media platform did Facebook cut them off from participating in that very platform.

Facebook baited users for over a decade, exploited those users to build a dominant global platform, then cut off the speech of certain selected users whose speech it didn’t like.

In this way, Facebook exploited the good will of its authentic users, then violated its social contract and business ethics, transforming its once-open platform into a discriminatory

echo chamber policed by intolerant, small-minded Leftists who have repeatedly demonstrated zero tolerance toward speech that violates their own limited worldview.

Facebook, in essence, *baited* users for over a decade, exploited those users to build a massive global platform that became the de facto standard for social media interaction, then cut off the speech of certain selected users whose speech it didn't like. This means the very premise of Facebook has been a fraud from day one.

If Facebook had launched its platform with its honest agenda: “Conservatives, Christians and straight white males are not welcomed here,” it never would have grown to become the dominant social media platform it has since achieved. The market dominance of Facebook, in other words, was entirely dependent on executing a “central deception” about its long-term agenda.

Stated another way, the market success of today's tech giants could never have been achieved if they had been honest about their true internal goals of discrimination and censorship. All of today's dominant tech giants were built on fraud and deception.

Online censorship is de facto denial of the right to exist in an interconnected world

To resolve the selective corporate censorship that targets political foes of left-wing America, lawmakers and internet participants must embrace the understanding that denial of the right to participate in the dominant online platforms for debate and expression is, in essence, an attack on the fundamental human right to exist in—and participate in—our modern tech-driven society.

If there were a broad marketplace of equally competing online services and gatekeepers with roughly equal market share, each representing different viewpoints or “clusters” of political thought, users would be free to choose, for example, the “pro-Trump” version of Facebook, Google, YouTube, Twitter, etc. But no such alternatives exist at anywhere close

to even 25% market share. These dominant internet gatekeepers enjoy market share dominance of 80% or better, in their respective categories, meaning that both content creators and content consumers have no reasonable alternative destinations from which to choose.

Furthermore, all of today's dominant tech giants lied about their policies from the very start, pretending to exist as open platforms welcoming all forms of legal speech. Yet after they achieved dominant market positions, aided by users promoting their channels on those platforms, they selectively began censoring and deplatforming conservative speech, casting aside the very people they once promised would be provided a platform for freedom of expression.

Through this deception, the dominant internet gatekeepers have become the de facto providers of essential infrastructure through which modern citizens carry out their personal and professional lives. To deny individuals their right to exist in modern society—by shadow banning, deplatforming or artificially throttling their online expression—is to violate an individual's pursuit of life, liberty and happiness. It is to deny their very right to exist in modern society.

Dominant online platforms have become the de facto providers of essential infrastructure through which modern citizens carry out their personal and professional lives. To maliciously censor those individuals due to the color of their speech is to deny them the right to meaningfully participate in modern society.

The political Left applauds the stripping away of the First Amendment rights of their political opponents, even while demanding such rights be protected for themselves

That the political Left in America today sees nothing wrong with the selective termination of the online existence of targeted political opponents is just as disturbing as the action itself, for it demonstrates the shocking lack of fairness or tolerance now routinely demonstrated by left-leaning individuals who themselves benefit from the very channels of expression they seek to deny to others.

The overriding internal justification for such an egregious—even malicious—justification is the belief that the only people who should be allowed to participate in modern society are those whom obediently agree with the ever-expanding list of left-wing “truisms,” many of which deny the most basic laws of biological and scientific reality (such as the now-common belief that infants are born as genderless beings who are arbitrarily “assigned” gender at birth, a belief that grossly contradicts biological and scientific reality).

In essence, Google, Facebook, YouTube, CNN, the Washington Post and others are asserting one of the most dangerous and absurd ideas in United States history: That if you do not wholeheartedly agree with the increasingly radical “truths” of left-wing society, you shall

be denied the right to exist altogether in modern society. Such positions have been openly argued in op-eds published in the New York Times, for example, where Bryan W. Van Norden, a professor of philosophy at Wuhan University in China, argued that no person should be allowed to speak in the online world unless they are first “properly educated” in liberal ideology (<https://www.newstarget.com/2018-06-27-nyt-op-ed-calls-for-the-complete-silencing-of-all-conservatives-forever.html>).

What is his definition of “properly educated?” For starters, he is a Chinese communist who believes in the supremacy of the state and the permanent subservience of citizens. We need not explore further, since his very nationality reflects an abusive, anti-humanitarian authoritative regime that nullifies any legitimacy of his argument.

De facto defamation

Because of the necessity of participation in the online world in order to pursue life, liberty and happiness in a tech-driven society, the censorship of an individual or organization by internet gatekeepers is a de facto act of defamation against that individual or organization.

Having your voice silenced by YouTube, for example, announces to the world that you must be an unscrupulous person of some kind; perhaps someone who violates intellectual property laws or who engages in unscrupulous spam. In truth, YouTube, Facebook and other internet gatekeepers have banned and shadow banned organizations for reasons rooted entirely in the color of their speech. It isn't just political speech that's targeted, either; it's also speech about natural health and disease prevention. Yet the perception among other members of the online community is that you have been punished for some egregious violation of ethics or rules, even when your only “sin” might have been to innocently post educational content the tech giants wish to suppress from public view.

Such suppression, by the way, need not have anything to do with political leanings. My own YouTube channel (“TheHealthRanger”) was completely shut off, without any warnings or strikes, following my posting of news report video documenting the true story of a woman who overcame stage-4 cancer by using CBD oil. That 43-second video, if you wish to review it, has since been posted on a private account at Vimeo: <https://vimeo.com/265601209>

Keep in mind that these actions were taken during the ramp-up toward the FDA's approval of the first CBD-based prescription medication in America, a "drug" named "Epidiolex." The drug consists entirely of CBD (cannabidiol), the very same molecule found in CBD oil and hemp extracts. (<https://www.naturalnews.com/2018-06-26-fda-finally-approves-usa-first-medicine-derived-from-marijuana.html>)

(It is an irrefutable scientific principle, by the way, that molecules are identical regardless of their source. A CBD molecule synthesized by a hemp plant is identical in structure, function and all chemical properties to a CBD molecule synthesized in a laboratory. For the FDA or an online platform to state that CBD in a drug form is therapeutic medicine but CBD from a plant is quackery or hokum is to deny the very existence of molecular science and the laws of cause of effect. **Molecules don't know how they came to be.** Their origins do not influence their chemical behavior.)

Thus, YouTube is deliberately banning users and entire accounts for discussing the therapeutic effects of a plant-derived molecule; the same molecule the FDA has just recognized as a therapeutic "drug" when sold with a specific brand name. (Epidiolex has no other active ingredients beyond CBD.) Such actions smack of Big Pharma protectionism and lend themselves to further investigations of potential collusion and racketeering among Google, Facebook, drug companies and the FDA.

Facebook has begun to deplatform prominent natural health channels

Facebook's baseless censorship of natural health-related accounts experienced a recent uptick when Facebook banned dozens of health-oriented accounts reaching an estimated 40 million followers. As reported by Phillip Schneider at Natural Blaze (<https://www.naturalblaze.com/2018/07/facebook-purges-over-80-accounts-sweeping-attack-alternative-media.html>), the Facebook purge of natural health websites included:

Collectively Conscious (915K followers) – Deleted on June 13th, 2018

The Censorship Master Plan Decoded

Healthy Food House (3.4M followers) – Deleted on June 13th, 2018

Natural Cures Not Medicine (2.3M followers) – Deleted on June 11th, 2018

Health Awareness (2.5M followers) – Deleted on June 13th, 2018

I Want to Be 100% Organic (700K followers) – Deleted on June 13th, 2018

Organic Health (230K followers) – Deleted on June 13th, 2018

Natural Cures From Food (120K followers) – Deleted on June 13th, 2018

Conscious Life News (1.1M follower) – Deleted on June 5th, 2018

... and dozens more. It is possible that some of these accounts may have been restored, but the fact that they were banned in the first place demonstrates the important point here.

Summary of Part One:

- Because society has shifted away from communications in the physical world (U.S. Postal Service mail, billboards, etc.) and moved almost entirely to electronic communications and online posting, the very existence of a business, organization or even a personal reputation depends strongly on their ability to participate in dominant online platforms without being subjected to malicious, selective censorship or shadow banning.
- Censorship is the online equivalent of being personally executed; denied the right to exist or participate in an online-connected society.
- The banning of online accounts can destroy an entire business (and it has, provably, in many examples). It can destroy reputations. Most importantly, from the point of view of the left-leaning tech giants, banning targeted accounts can also **strongly influence future elections** by silencing the speech of those whom Facebook and Google do not want to have a voice.
- The Leftists who run the dominant online platforms demand First Amendment protections for themselves while demanding such protections be denied to their political opponents. They are applauding the censorship now taking place, and they are calling for such efforts to be accelerated.

Part Two: The Fight for Reality (censorship motivations and justifications)

Why achieving censorship is important to the centralized media establishment

The purpose of controlled news is to influence and engineer the narratives that form the beliefs and even the “fabric of reality” for news consumers. One of the reasons corrupt government universally exerts dominance over its own national media is because whoever controls the news controls “reality.” That reality is shaped, twisted and sometimes fabricated entirely from scratch by controlled media outlets which universally declare themselves to be the sole arbiters of truth in any given society. Losing control of the narrative means losing control over society.

Since the rise of the internet—a disruptive new structure of connectivity that achieved mass *decentralization* of information—the controlled news monopolies have lost their position of dominant control over the narratives of society. This means they no longer command absolute authority over the “narrative” interpretation of real-world events, so their ability to distort or misrepresent those events for their own political control is rapidly eroding. This was all underscored with the victory of Donald Trump in the 2016 election—an outcome that could never have occurred without independent, decentralized media achieving prominent influence on the ‘net.

Maintaining monopoly control over cultural narratives is crucial for commanding primary influence over the worldview held by news consumers, whose beliefs, opinions and “realities” are largely shaped by the news to which they are subjected.

Censorship is the primary weapon being invoked by media monopolists to destroy their competition and regain an authoritative monopoly over the concept known as “news” (which is, technically, a series of scripted narratives authored to achieve specific psychological goals, not anything resembling an intellectually honest representation of relevant events in the real world).

To accomplish this censorship, both media monopolists (i.e. CNN, WashPost, etc.) and tech giants (Google, Facebook, etc.) pursue a wide assortment of malicious techniques to deplatform, shadow ban, smear, disconnect or otherwise down-rank selected independent media publishers that threaten their news dominance. Many of these methods are pursued covertly, and they are all pursued with virtually zero regulatory oversight or restriction.

This report outlines those tactics and mechanisms, including both technical and psychological censorship weapons now deployed by Google, Facebook, YouTube, CNN, the New York Times and others.

What is “news?”

To fully understand the censorship strategies leveled against independent news publishers by the news establishment, we must first understand the definition of “news.”

The false assertion of establishment news—the public front—claims that news is an accurate, unbiased reporting of real-world events which are relevant to the lives of news

consumers. According to establishment news propagandists, they never insert themselves into the news, and they don't manipulate the news. They merely report "facts" without any bias whatsoever, and they claim to have no hidden agendas or ulterior motives whatsoever.

In reality, "news" is the primary conduit through which narratives / stories are implanted into the consciousness of news consumers. These stories shape the way people think, talk and behave in society. They even shape the way people vote, revealing the real priority of the left-leaning news establishment. The label of "news" is simply the cover story for what might be more accurately called a "national suggestion / influence campaign" which deliberately works to influence public opinion, distort the perception of real-world events, manipulate the minds of viewers and achieve hidden political goals such as promoting transgenderism, banning the Second Amendment or abolishing America's border security (as current event examples).

Because the very premise of "news" claimed by the media establishment is fraudulent, the idea that they magically possess a divine monopoly on "truth" is absurd.

Because the very premise of "news" as reported by the establishment media today (CNN, WashPost, etc.) is fraudulent, the idea that these very same organizations have a magical, divine monopoly on "truth" is intellectually null and void. Simply put, nearly everything broadcast in America today under the banner of establishment "news" is better described as propaganda with a hidden purpose.

For example, during the 2016 campaign, establishment news sources widely reported on distorted political polls which claimed to show that Hillary Clinton would easily win the election. By reporting on the manipulated polls (which were later shown to deliberately over-sample Democrats by enormous margins), the "news" media hoped to create the false impression that practically everyone in America was voting for Hillary Clinton and that Trump had no chance whatsoever to win.

Under the guise of “news,” the real purpose of this psychological campaign was to deflate Trump supporters and dissuade them from wasting their time “voting for a candidate who was doomed to lose anyway.” This is just one example among thousands of how the so-called “news” media is actually a social manipulation and propaganda platform.

Irrefutable truths of news gathering and reporting

In attacking the independent media, centralized news monopolists pretend that the following irrefutable truths about news gathering and reporting do not exist:

1) All news institutions make mistakes from time to time

Because news is gathered and reported by human beings who are not immune to mistakes, all news institutions will make mistakes from time to time. This is universally acknowledged across all media, yet the controlled media monopolists selectively insist that independent media may not ever make a single error, or they will be forever accused of publishing “fake news.”

2) All news institutions make editorial decisions that are filtered through human psychology and are therefore biased at their moment of origin

Because news publishing decisions are filtered through human psychology, they are inherently biased. There is no such thing as a human being who has not experienced the world from their own self-absorbed point of view. This speaks to the root philosophical question of, “What is reality?”

In truth, **no human being has a monopoly on reality**. All humans, including those in the monopoly media establishment, carry distortions in their worldview. Thus, even if those individuals attempt a perfect record of unbiased, accurate news reporting, they will inadvertently make editorial decisions that are filtered through their own distorted worldview

(including decisions of stories to avoid covering, not just editorial angles on stories that are being covered).

Leftists assign to themselves the imaginary quality that pretends they alone are able to see the world with God-like clarity, absent any distortions or opinions whatsoever. In pretending to be God, they reveal themselves to be fools.

The assertion by CNN that their news editors have superhuman abilities to eliminate all bias and view the entire world with God-like accuracy is as absurd as Peter Strzok testifying before Congress that he never allowed his “F###k Trump” attitude to creep into his official duties at the FBI. This imaginary quality that Leftists ascribe solely to themselves—that they alone see the world with God-like clarity and truth—is the height of self-delusion and arrogance. Yet it has become the default position of news monopolists, and it forms the basis for their accusations that others are engaged in “fake news” while they, themselves, possess the divine right to determine “real news.”

This self-delusion by media monopolists is extremely dangerous to society. It is part of what makes CNN the “enemy of America,” as President Trump has accurately stated. When an institution believes it is not merely above the law but also *above all judgment* because it *defines* reality, that institution has plunged down the path of dogmatic self-denial that can only lead to destructive outcomes for all those involved.

Never forget that the central assertion of media monopolists is that independent media is *incapable* of being as “authoritative” as they are, because they alone possess the unique, divine, superhuman power of omniscience, yet they remain utterly incapable of explaining how they were able to achieve such powers or why those powers repeatedly fail as demonstrated by their repeated news errors and corrections.

Does a reporter magically gain omniscience immediately upon being added to the CNN payroll? The idea is, of course, absurd. Yet this is precisely what CNN asserts it is somehow able to achieve. This assertion, of course, must be made with the extreme intellectual dishonesty that comes from knowing that CNN itself makes repeated, egregious errors in its own reporting. Occasionally, it even corrects such errors.

In essence, media monopolists claim they are gods who possess the divine right to interpret reality for the masses. This claim smacks of journo-cultism, as it is no different from the delusions of the high priests of ancient Maya or Aztec cultures, who also proclaimed that only a select class of divinely-ordained individuals could speak to God and interpret reality for the masses. In many cases, they then kidnapped children, stabbed them in the heart and threw them down the stone stairs of elaborate pyramids in a visually stunning “sacrifice” that demanded absolute obedience and conformity among the stunned masses. Today, CNN essentially demands the same power and obedience, but instead of sacrificing just a few children, anti-truth news organizations like CNN and the anti-America Washington Post are willing to sacrifice our entire nation in their quest for absolute power and universal obedience among the masses.

The very fabric of our society is now being deliberately sacrificed by media and tech monopolists in their desperate, destructive quest to regain narrative control at any cost.

3) A more legitimate definition of “fake news” should be rooted in the principle of the intention of the people producing their news

If a news institution intends to produce accurate news, but makes a mistake and accidentally publishes news with an error, is that “fake news?” Of course not: That’s legitimate journalism with an occasional error. When such errors are committed by established news monopolists, those errors are universally considered to be innocent and excusable, because they are eventually (but not always) corrected.

Yet when such errors are made by independent media outlets, and then corrected, such organizations are forever smeared by the news monopolists with labels of “fake news,”

repeatedly referring to the original error as a prime example of the fakery of the news organization.

News monopolists assert that they alone possess a divine right to commit an unlimited number of factual errors, even while claiming that a single error found in the independent media proves them to forever engaged in “fake news.”

This double standard is, of course, unfair by design. In essence, established news monopolists believe that they alone have a divine right to make an unlimited number of errors (usually on the front page) and then correct them later (in small print on page five), while they simultaneously believe that error corrections issued by independent news organizations should never be recognized at all.

The classic example of this gross double standard is the media's incessant accusation against Alex Jones of InfoWars, claiming that he stated no one died at Sandy Hook. While early reporting by Jones could have been interpreted by reasonable people as inferring that conclusion, Jones has since repeatedly and wholly corrected the record on that front and has publicly offered to meet with the parents of the children who were killed in order to apologize to them in person. To the knowledge of this author, there is not a single news monopolist organization that has reported Jones' apology nor his offer to meet with the parents and apologize to them in person. Not surprisingly, the primary attack on Jones' reputation continues to consist of accusations that he claimed no children died at Sandy Hook, even though he has repeatedly and thoroughly retracted any such claim.

Accepting the corrections of independent news organizations, of course, would eliminate the “fake news” narrative that CNN uses as a weapon to call for the outright banning of InfoWars. The assertion is that InfoWars must never be allowed to correct any news report, but that CNN, WashPost, NYT and other outlets are universally allowed to publish stories

containing serious factual errors, even if they never bother to prominently correct them at all. For example, where is the Washington Post apology to President Trump for repeatedly and falsely accusing him of conspiring with the Russians to steal the election?

CNN, as another example, never reports that the Washington Post is fake news, even though WashPost has been repeatedly caught publishing stories containing documented, serious factual errors rooted in sloppy journalism and an utter disregard for any serious fact-checking. The Washington Post, for example, had to forfeit a Pulitzer Prize after being caught utterly fabricating the entire article series which earned the prize in the first place (https://www.naturalnews.com/056196_Washington_Post_fake_news_Pulitzer_Prize.html).

A short list of Washington Post news fakery can be found at:

https://www.naturalnews.com/049967_Washington_Post_fake_journalism_media_propaganda.html

A far more detailed list of documented media lies, propaganda and deliberate fake news has been published by independent journalist Sharyl Attkisson. See all 55 mistakes, most of which have never been retracted or corrected, at this link:

<https://sharylattkisson.com/2018/07/11/50-media-mistakes-in-the-trump-era-the-definitive-list>

Notably, the very organizations who claim the independent media is engaged in “fake news” are, themselves, the worst offenders who traffic in such deceptions. CNN and WashPost, for example, deliberately distort reporting on events, fabricate fake “anonymous sources,” selectively bury news stories they don’t want the public to see, and engage in a long list of other dishonest, deceptive activities that clearly qualify their organizations as being engaged in fake news.

CNN, for example, repeatedly fakes the locations of reporters, using green screen chroma key background replacements that mislead viewers or situating two reporters on the opposite sides of a parking lot while pretending they are hundreds or thousands of miles

apart. (<https://www.infowars.com/cnn-anchors-pretend-theyre-having-a-satellite-interview-even-though-theyre-in-the-same-parking-lot>)

If Facebook were to ban any organizations for repeatedly engaging in fake news, CNN and the Washington Post would, by any reasonable definition, be at the very top of that list. Similarly, if Google News abided by any realistic standards of journalistic integrity, both CNN and the Washington Post would have to be permanently banned.

Summary of Part Two

- Control of public narratives is viewed by media monopolists as critical for controlling the masses.
- “News” is the label used by media monopolists who pretend to be engaged in a public service when they are actually engaged in public indoctrination and deceptive influence campaigns.
- All news organizations commit errors. Media monopolists pretend that their errors don’t count.
- Establishment media operatives pretend they possess a divine, god-like ability to discern reality without bias, and they claim that they alone have access to this ability.

Part Three: The Fallacy of “Fake News”

The fallacy of “real” news vs. fake news

The push for the outright banning of so-called “fake news” is rooted in the logical fallacy that only one particular institution or group of organizations has a special, divine monopoly on facts. This argument is equivalent to the pre-Magna Carta construct that Kings derived their power from God, and thus Kings had a divine right to order peasants to do their bidding. The King was always presumed to be right, the belief held, because his information was divinely touched and therefore *defined* what was right vs. wrong.

Today, establishment news institutions claim a similar “divine right” to be the sole arbiters of truth vs. fiction. This claim is, of course, utterly absurd, as those very institutions are largely devoted to fabricating their own news, twisting real-world events, deliberately misleading viewers on relevant topics, blacklisting news stories they don’t want the public to see and otherwise pursuing deceptive and manipulative narratives that are rightly described as the “weaponization” of news for the purpose of thrusting ideas into the minds of the masses so that individuals might make decisions opposed to their own self interest.

The key goal of media monopolists is to thrust ideas into the minds of news consumers that encourage them to take actions which contradict their own self-interest.

In other words, the real purpose of the centrally-controlled news establishment is to prevent citizens from forming their own free conclusions and acting on those conclusions

with intelligence and rationality. When independent media sources encourage individual self-aware thinking and skepticism about the establishment interpretation of real-world events, those media sources must be vigorously attacked, smeared and suppress by the establishment in order to eliminate competing narratives that might cause news consumers to “snap out” of their “news hypnosis,” so to speak.

This underscores the power of a single question, such as a child asking, “Why is the Emperor naked?” (A reference to the Emperor Has No Clothes fable.) Because a single question from a non-conforming, non-hypnotized independent source can disrupt the mass influence engineering of conformist crowds, the highest priority of establishment news monopolists must be to silence all opposing voices so that they dare not utter a single question which might challenge the engineered fabrications of the establishment.

The highest priority of news monopolists is to silence independent, opposing voices that encourage individuals to “snap out” of their numbed, passive acquiescence to mainstream news narratives.

Simple questions such as, “Why has the U.S. government never released video footage of a commercial jetliner crashing into the Pentagon on 9/11?” tend to awaken people from their numbed news slumber. Such opening questions may also lead to additional uncomfortable questions that the media absolutely does not want to have to process, such as, “How did the third building crumble to the ground on 9/11 when it wasn’t struck by any airplane at all?” (This question is chosen here precisely because it sets off hysterical alarm bells across the controlled monopolist media which has long tried to bury the very existence of that third building from the minds of the public.)

Continued compliance to false mainstream news narratives requires ongoing, repeated indoctrination and information dominance by propagandists

In essence, censorship of the independent media is a necessary component of the continuous (but fragile) indoctrination of the news consuming public. Just as a stage hypnotist knows that continued compliance with the programmed suggestions requires a supportive, non-confrontational environment which accepts the bizarre actions of the hypnosis subject as “normal,” news monopolists also understand that the success of their own fake news narratives cannot be achieved if there is even a single interruptive voice that pesters the hypnotized masses with provocative questions.

In the realm of hypnosis and NLP, this is called a “pattern interrupt,” and in the world of independent media, Alex Jones is the key “interruptor” due to both the provocative nature of his content as well as his aggressive delivery style. It is precisely this kind of combination of content and delivery that can “snap” people out of a mental slumber. This is exactly why Alex Jones is the No. 1 target of the news monopolists who depend on zero interruptions for the continued success of their disinformation narratives which are packaged as “news.”

Alex Jones is targeted under the accusation of “fake news,” but the real reason he’s attacked is because he interrupts the continuous indoctrination efforts of globalist-run media outlets.

Reiterated, it takes constant repetition of disinformation to lull news consumers into a news trance, but it takes just one interrupter to break the spell and jolt people back to their

senses. Alex Jones is the mental “jolt” of modern news, which is exactly why he is directly targeted by the news establishment for immediate termination. The justification for targeting Jones is the claim that he engages in “fake news,” but the real reason for targeting Jones is because he shatters the near-hypnotic influence of media monopolists, causing news consumers to question their reality.

How media monopolists transform a lie into a new “truth”

“Fake news” accusations of the established media monopolists are often supported by citing other established media monopolists. This circular reasoning asserts that because the NYT, for example, is an “authoritative” source, anything appearing in the NYT is automatically true. Even if it is factually in error, this new “truth” is then cited by the Washington Post or CNN in order to spread the falsehood under the cover of “authoritative” news (which is also, of course, put into the highest ranking positions by Google, YouTube, Facebook, etc.).

From there, second-tier propaganda organizations such as BuzzFeed, Politico or Salon craft their own propaganda stories, citing NYT, WashPost and CNN as “authoritative” sources. The lie is further “fact-checked” into existence by Snopes, Politifact or other scurrilous “fact-checking” organizations, nearly all of which are entirely dominated by left-wing bias and technically make a mockery of the very definition of “facts.”

From here, obedient liberals on social media can engage in tweets, Facebook posts, online debates, YouTube video posting or other forms of content distribution, all while citing these “authoritative” news sources and fact-checkers, claiming, “See? It’s all true!”

Through this method, utterly fabricated “facts” can then achieve what propagandists call a “consensus confirmation.” Once a lie has achieved this “consensus,” it is then *assumed* to be true by the non-logic assertion that if enough people believe something, it must therefore be true.

This assertion is, of course, utterly absurd. At one time, nearly all human beings on the planet believed the Earth was flat. The Flat Earth view had achieved “consensus” and therefore, according to modern left-wing media standards, needed no evidence to back it up. It *must* be true, the saying went, because almost everybody believed it.

In exactly the same way, the monopolist media has erected outrageous fabrications and achieved “consensus” (majority) agreement on many issues, even when they are rooted in utter nonsense. Examples:

EXAMPLE #1) Nearly all members of the monopolist media—as well as their news consumers—believe that carbon dioxide is a “pollutant” which must be eliminated from the atmosphere in order to achieve a more “green” planet. Such an idea makes a complete mockery of legitimate science, botany and atmospheric chemistry, given that CO₂ is precisely the molecule that greens the planet by powering the biochemistry of plants.

Technically, CO₂ should be called the “greening molecule,” as higher concentrations of CO₂ in the atmosphere lead to a resurgence of rainforests, the blooming of flowers in rainforests (<https://www.naturalnews.com/2018-01-29-higher-carbon-dioxide-in-the-atmosphere-more-flowers-blooming-tropical-forests.html>), the recapture of arid lands into food producing lands, the accelerated production of food via food crops and many other benefits.

This simple scientific fact seems to have never been acknowledged by any “authoritative” news organization, which is equivalent to the NYT continuing to insist that the Earth is flat.

Example #2) The entire “Russia collusion” hoax—which claimed that the Trump campaign deliberately colluded with “the Russians” to steal the election from Hillary Clinton—is rooted in an elaborate network of shared delusions, deep state fabrications and false beliefs. To date, not a single shred of legitimate evidence has been found that shows such collusion.

Furthermore, the entire media establishment has failed to report the mechanism by which an election could be “stolen” in the first place. Were voting machines hacked? Were voters forced to vote for someone they hate? President Obama himself stated clearly that U.S.

elections are “too decentralized” to be stolen. (He made this statement at a time when he and most others believed Clinton could not be defeated.) The claimed influence of a few hundred thousand dollars in Facebook ads is absurd when compared to the nearly \$1 billion in campaign funds raised and largely spent by Hillary Clinton (not to mention the 90% pro-Clinton slant of the media itself).

The entire “Russians stole the election” narrative is the greatest example of actual fake news our modern society has ever witnessed. So why isn’t CNN demanding that CNN itself be deplatformed for broadcasting fake news? If verifiable truth is the real measure of news authority, CNN has no authority at all.

Example #3) The entire monopolist media continues to assert three blatant lies about vaccines and immunology: 1) That vaccines are perfectly safe and have no risks whatsoever, 2) That vaccines always save lives and never spread infectious disease, 3) That vaccines are rooted in irrefutable science that no person can question, ever. All three assertions are provable lies.

For example, the U.S. government itself has paid out over \$3 billion in damage settlements to families of vaccine-damaged children. (<http://www.vaccines.news/2016-06-06-if-vaccines-are-safe-why-has-the-us-gov-paid-out-3-billion-to-vaccine-injured-families.html>).

Government statics contained in the VAERS reporting system openly admit to thousands of children being harmed or killed by vaccines each year (<https://vaers.hhs.gov/data.html>). According to the CDC, vaccines contain numerous ingredients which are well-documented to be neurotoxic substances, including formaldehyde, mercury, monosodium glutamate and many others (http://www.naturalnews.com/037653_vaccine_additives_thimerosal_formaldehyde.html).

Further, vaccine insert sheets themselves openly admit that certain vaccines may spread infectious disease due to “viral shedding” (<https://www.naturalnews.com/2018-01-30-flu-vaccine-bombshell-630-more-aerosolized-flu-virus-particles-emitted-by-people-who-received-flu-shots-flu-vaccines-actually-spread-the-flu.html>).

Natural News has published photos of actual flu shot vaccine inserts which unambiguously state that flu shots have “no controlled trials demonstrating a decrease in influenza.” (https://www.naturalnews.com/048422_flu_shot_scientific_fraud_controlled_trials.html) The same insert sheet states, “Safety and effectiveness of FLULAVAL in pediatric patients have not been established.” Yet, the mere publishing of a vaccine insert sheet alongside accurate citing of the words on the sheet now earns you a “fake news” attack by the media monopolists, all of whom ridiculously claim that vaccines have no risks and are universally rooted in irrefutable science which may never be questioned, by decree.

Similarly, the mere publishing of government statistics regarding vaccine injuries and deaths is vigorously attacked by the monopolist media as “fake news” and “anti-science,” even though such reports are rooted in real statistics and irrefutable science.

The vaccine issue alone proves that media monopolists are irreconcilable with “truth” by any reasonable definition of the term. They systematically and repeatedly lie about vaccines, and they go out of their way to smear the reputations of any individual or organization that dares awaken the public to legitimate, science-based questions about vaccine safety, vaccine ingredients or vaccine adverse events.

This is not a left vs. right issue, either. One of the most prominent organizations now questioning the elaborate vaccine cover-up carried out by the CDC-obedient media is none other than Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., of the World Mercury Project (WorldMercuryProject.org).

In conclusion, the news establishment’s attack on the independent media as being “fake news” is rooted in the false idea that certain selected human beings have a divine monopoly on truth. This is psychologically impossible, as every human being sees the world through the distortions of their own experience. When a group of distorted individuals forms a news network—such as CNN—the distortions are multiplied, not nullified. Joining a monopolist news network, in other words, does not erase your perceptions and beliefs. If anything, it amplifies them.

The very *assertion* that one group of human beings who derive their paychecks from

centralized, monopolistic news sources have a “divine right” to interpret truth exclusively to their point of view is, itself, fake news. Thus, when CNN proclaims InfoWars to be fake news, CNN makes a mockery of itself by demonstrating the actions of a fake news network that is terrified of being made obsolete by a far more genuine and truthful competitor.

The fallacy of “hate speech” and left-wing fanaticism

One of the pillars of the internal justifications for banning political speech is the invocation of “hate speech.”

Internet gatekeepers such as Google, YouTube and Facebook, deliberately conflate the label of “hate speech” with conservative views, pretending that individuals seeking to defend their national borders are therefore by definition “haters” of ethnic illegal immigrants. Similarly, cultural agendas such as LGBT transgenderism are considered “love” by the left-leaning internet gatekeepers, meaning by definition that any who oppose a transgenderism agenda—including the transgender indoctrination of children—must be primarily motivated by “hate.”

In essence, anything the Left wants to promote is labeled “love” while everything conservatives support is labeled “hate.” These labels are arbitrarily assigned based entirely on tribal bias, utterly failing any legitimate test of universal rules or logic. For example, if a universal rule is written that says individuals may honor their cultural heritage, that rule must then be selectively reversed exclusively for people who are white Southerners in America, since the bigoted Left believes that white people who live in the South must never be allowed to celebrate their own history and culture, as an example.

“Hate speech” is being defined by those who are, themselves, filled with hatred toward America, Christians, unborn babies and individual liberties

Through this gross distortion and selective reasoning, the label “hate speech” has been used to shadow ban, blacklist and outright ban content that is pro-America, pro-Trump, pro-Second Amendment, pro-liberty, pro-Christian, pro-life and so on. While any of these positions could be described as “love” by a reasonable person—we love America, we love Trump, we love our gun rights, we love liberty, we love God, we love unborn babies—the intellectually dishonest Left chooses to arbitrarily describe them in terms of “hate.”

What is the basis of such a label? There is no logical basis. The “hate” label actually expresses the inner hatred of Leftists more than anything attributable to someone else. Use of the “hate speech” term simply comes down to whatever positions the political Left opposes. Essentially, Leftists who run the tech giants of today **almost universally believe that all opposition against their agendas is rooted in “hate” and must therefore be silenced.**

Stated another way, definitions of “hate” as promoted by internet gatekeepers are, not surprisingly, almost impossible to define in any logically consistent way. For example, to express pride in your culture is rejoiced if you are African-American, LGBT, female or a refugee, but to express pride in your culture if you are a Christian, male, heterosexual or Caucasian is immediately branded “hate.” Thus, the very definition of “hate” defies all attempts at a reasonable definition. It all boils down to the irrefutable realization that “hate speech” is simply **any speech which contradicts the shifting narratives of the political Left.**

The political Left has abandoned any willingness to participate in discussion or debate

Notably, the Left in America today no longer believes that dialog or debate can serve any useful function in achieving their authoritarian goals. With the help of internet giants, they have shifted their goals to outright censorship, a kind of online book burning in the modern world.

Voices of opposition to their agendas must never be allowed to exist at all, they believe, and this belief can only be described as a kind of “fanaticism” among the very Leftists who absurdly believe that they operate out of a monopoly on LOVE.

Leftists in America no longer believe that open dialog or debate can serve any useful function in achieving their authoritarian goals. “Hate speech” is the convenient label used to silence all opposition.

“Hate speech” has become the No. 1 justification among tech giants for banning independent media websites. When YouTube moderators, for example, encounter something they don’t like—such as a video of a #MAGA hat or the American flag—they decide to *feel* hateful in their own minds, allowing them to flag the video as “hate speech.”

Hate speech is the Salem Witch Trials test of the modern technology era. They throw you in a pond, and if you float, you’re obviously a witch who needs to be burned at the stake. If you sink, you’re innocent but dead. Similarly, Google, Facebook, YouTube and Twitter moderators run your content through the virtual witch hunt of “hate speech,” declaring

that if your speech makes somebody—anybody—feel offended, you must be engaged in hateful conduct, and that violates their community guidelines.

Whoever has the power to define “hate” and use it as justification for censorship has obtained the power to dictate the content of every opinion uttered online.

But who determines the definition of hate? The most hateful members of modern society, of course: The very Leftists who hate America, hate the President, hate the Constitution, hate the Bill of Rights, hate freedom of speech, hate the American flag, hate America’s Founding Fathers, hate law and order, hate the police, hate the energy industry, hate white people, hate Christians, hate God and hate almost everything else that most Americans value. Thus, the haters have been put in charge of deciding the very definition of hate speech, and they predictably wield that authority as a weapon to punish their political enemies, whom they also hate.

Summary of Part Three:

- The purpose of controlling the “news” is to control the narratives that strongly influence the beliefs and actions of news consumers for a multitude of purposes, including shaping the outcome of political elections.
- The news establishment’s assertion that they are merely reporting facts without bias is fraudulent and deliberately deceptive.
- “Fake news” is the actual business model of the establishment media monopolists, who knowingly exploit and abuse their positions of news authority to broadcast disinformation and propaganda for the purpose of covert social influence.
- “Hate speech” is a fictitious fabrication invoked by the authoritarian Left to silence their targeted political enemies. There is not logically consistent definition of “hate speech” that any Leftist can describe, because no such universal standard exists.
- Whoever has the power to define “hate” gains the power to dictate the content of every opinion uttered online. Such power, concentrated in the hands of a biased few, is extraordinarily dangerous to any free society.

Part Four: Decentralization and the Structure of News Consumption

Understanding how information consumers connect with news

To fully grasp how news censorship is achieved, it's crucial to understand the ways in which news consumers come into contact with news sources and information. The method of contact determines the most effective method of censorship, as you will see explained below.

Direct URLs and Apps

This is achieved when users open a web browser and directly enter the URL of the website they wish to visit (i.e. www.trump.news). This approach is decentralized and puts consumers in control. However, many news consumers are surprisingly lazy, and some don't even know the internet exists outside of Facebook. Accordingly, many internet users rely on other aggregators or "feeders" to feed them news articles, removing control from the individual.

Direct Access can also be achieved by download an app for a news publishers and running that app on a mobile device. Google and Apple, not surprisingly, have censored certain apps to crush their competition and block consumers from accessing information that Google doesn't want people to see. For example, GAB.ai saw its app blocked by Google under the justification that GAB.ai allowed people to express "hate speech" on its platform.

News Aggregators

News aggregators include the Drudge Report (www.DrudgeReport.com), Google News, Censored.news (owned by this author) and others. News aggregators serve a utility function of compiling news headlines from many different sources, potentially saving time for news consumers. However, while some news aggregators are entirely uncensored and pull every headline from the sources which are scanned (such as Censored.news), most news aggregators make either manual or human-programmed, automated editorial decisions, compiling a list of desired headlines to show visitors (Drudge Report, Google News, etc.)

News aggregators can save time for users and help them discover news sources they may not have otherwise found on their own. However, they cede some level of control to the aggregation entity, taking away power from the individual and concentrating it in the hands of the aggregator who can engage in “censorship by omission” and simply refuse to list any news source they don’t like. Technically, because no news aggregation website can possibly cover every news source on the ‘net, all news aggregators assert some level of editorial control, merely by deciding which news sources to include.

Google News, famously, purged itself of nearly all independent media sources beginning in 2012, leading to it becoming a homogenized echo chamber of controlled media monopolists.

Newsfeeds

Facebook is the best example of a “newsfeed,” which presents content (videos, links, images) for end user consumption but controls the feed to down-rank and “shadow ban” certain sources which are targeted with punitive ranking algorithms. For example, Facebook allows end users to “like” or follow certain news publishers such as InfoWars or Natural News. However, when InfoWars posts a new article on Facebook, the distribution of that article is typically 99.9% suppressed (shadow banned), allowing the article to only appear among 0.1% of the followers who have raised their hands and asked to receive InfoWars articles.

Twitter is, in essence, a feed system where users are able to follow particular twitter users or monitor hashtag-containing tweets. Just as with Facebook, Twitter can also “shadow ban” users by refusing to distribute their tweets to all their twitter followers. The “shadow” part of shadow banning comes from the realization that the original author of the tweet has no idea their message is being largely banned. From their point of view, the tweet was accepted and broadcast to all their followers, but in reality, it may have only reached a tiny fraction of their followers because the Twitter corporation disagrees with the content of what they sought to express.

The mechanism of banning certain sources in “feeds” is a **black box algorithm**, secretly carried out using unknown variables or outcomes. Companies like Facebook refuse to disclose the inner mechanisms or variable weighting of their algorithms, and such algorithms may in fact consist largely of “Which publishers do we hate today?”

Public Platforms / Social Media

Public platforms such as YouTube and Facebook claims to provide independent content creators a public space through which they can broadcast their own content to followers. Through this content channel, content creators are able to post various types of content, depending on the platform in question (photos, videos, articles, tweets, links, etc.).

Public platforms achieve a tipping point of utility in the minds of users when a critical mass of other users are using the same platform, allowing for a very large user base to intermix their interests, opinions and conversations. Getting big, in other words, makes the public platform website even more dominant in the industry via a self-reinforcing feedback loop of perceived public utility. (In other words, nobody wants to visit a social media website if nobody else is using it. Similarly, no one wishes to visit an unpopular dance club. People go where others congregate, precisely because they are seeking social interaction.)

During their growth, public platforms asserted the promise that content creators would not be censored or blacklisted without just cause. This allowed YouTube, Facebook, Pinterest, Snapchat and other similar sites to attract enormous numbers of users. Once

the critical mass of utility was achieved, many of these public platforms began selectively shadow banning or deplatforming selected users based on the politics of their content, thus violating the original promise made by the platforms.

On the positive side, public platforms allow one individual to potential reach a very large established audience without needing to build their own publishing sites or services, but they also subject individual content creators to sudden and unjustified termination, shadow banning, “doubt interruptions” or other forms of oppression and censorship (see complete list in the next chapter).

In essence, as the tech giants are currently operated, whoever controls the platform ultimately controls the speech which is allowed to be broadcast on that platform. For the internet to survive as an infrastructure rooted in individual liberty and freedom of speech, the status quo of platform censorship must obviously be wholly reformed.

Search engines

Many news consumers use search engines (like Google, Bing, DuckDuckGo) to locate and read news articles. Search engine ranking algorithms are a “black box” that’s routinely manipulated to down-rank certain independent news sources which are targeted by the tech giants.

Without needing to outright ban a particular source, a search engine operating with nefarious intent can down-rank a particular source to the point of online oblivion. Internet user behavior tells us that news sources which do not rank in the first page of search results receive almost no traffic from such search results.

This author believes that Google assigns “bonus” ranking boosts to manually-chosen websites such as CNN.com, granting them heightened visibility that was not earned through the merit of their content. Search algorithms are, in essence, weighted by an “authoritative” score which is largely determined by the personal opinions of Google engineers and management, most of whom tend to strongly lean toward a left-wing bias as evidence by

the James Damore lawsuit against Google (<https://www.newstarget.com/2018-01-17-19-insane-tidbits-from-james-damores-lawsuit-about-googles-office-environment.html>). The end result is that conservative or independent news sources almost certainly endure unearned punishments in Google's ranking algorithm, all of which are manually inflicted by human processes.

To date, Google has refused to disclose its ranking algorithm and considers it a proprietary secret. The secrecy, of course, permits Google to manually tweak its algorithm in whatever way it wishes, including exerting unearned punitive bias against websites which happen to exist on Google's ever-expanding "hate list" of websites which promote conservatism, natural health or other "banned" topics.

Email Newsletters

Many independent media publishers rely on email newsletters to directly reach their audience via email. However, two of the most prominent email destinations—Gmail and Yahoo Mail—systematically block emails from content sources they don't like, halting the delivery of such emails to their email users.

Thus, Google can exert the power to ban a publisher's channel on YouTube, blacklist that same publisher's web pages on Google.com and even block that publisher's email newsletters from being delivered to gmail.com users. This is a "triple threat" censorship regime that grants Google an alarming level of control over the delivery of communications across the internet, even to users who have specifically asked to receive such communications (such as email newsletters to which they have subscribed).

In essence, Gmail is claiming to serve the function of a postal carrier who delivers mail you've requested to your mailbox. But during the delivery, Gmail carriers open and read your mail, and if they don't like what they read, they trash your letter and refuse to deliver it. Google actively and mercilessly pursues this interference action against targeted publishers on a daily basis. While interfering with the delivery of a U.S. Postal Service letter is a felony crime, Google actively interferes with the delivery of electronic mail on a minute-by-minute basis, with no apparent criminal liability whatsoever.

Summary of Part Four:

- For each of these methods by which users connect with news sources (direct URLs, news aggregators, newsfeeds, search engines, email newsletters), internet gatekeepers maintain an array of weapons and tools to block communications and isolate users from the news sources they actively wish to see. (Keep reading to discover the censorship mechanisms, below.)
- Additionally, non-technical censorship methods such as **reputation assassination** and **demonization** add additional layers of censorship control. These are discussed in more detail, below.

Part Five: Technological and Psychological Methods of Overt and Covert Censorship

Censorship of targeted websites is achieved not only through technical (mechanical) means, but also through the coordinated application of psychological weapons which intend to create doubt and mistrust toward targeted websites / publishers.

Technical methods of censoring targeted independent news outlets

While other methods exist, the primary technical methods with the most destructive impact are:

- Demonetization
- Shadow banning
- Deplatforming
- Black box search algorithms
- Email interference

Demonetization

Internet gatekeepers don't stop at merely banning, shadow banning or blocking accounts; they also engage in a kind of **economic warfare** known as "demonetization."

This form of economic warfare against independent media publishers is widely practiced by Google and Facebook by cutting off publishers from customary revenue sources

(advertising) which are simultaneously kept in place for “agreeable” news publishers (i.e. left-wing content publishers).

Demonetization, which began in earnest following the 2016 President election, has been devastating to the vast majority of independent publishers, with revenues falling 90% among many. The policy of demonetization was accelerated following the faux outrage campaign organized by the now-discredited Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC), which organized grassroots efforts to attack advertisers whose ads appeared adjacent to content from conservative publishers. This engineered campaign coalesced into intense pressure inside Google and Facebook to block all advertising from appearing on channels offering conservative or pro-Trump content.

Because of Google’s dominant influence in the online advertising marketplace, Google is also able to influence second-tier advertising firms and ad “remarketing” companies to ban ads from certain publishers or individuals. The InfoWars Store, for example, was banned from third-party remarketing advertising due to pressure from Google, and this took place even though the InfoWars Store sells nutritional products, air filters and home living products which are equivalently sold by Amazon, Whole Foods and many other companies. Notably, the ban against InfoWars Store remarketing was justified based entirely on the news content of the InfoWars platform, not any problem with InfoWars Store products.

This means that online advertising giants—and their second-tier advertising partners—are now censoring e-commerce based entirely on their personal dislike for the speech content originating from a news brand that’s *related* to the e-commerce platform. In the real world, this would be equivalent to a TV station banning ads from a car dealer because the owner of that dealer gave a history speech to high school students, honoring the Founding Fathers of America.

“Demonetization” essentially means that if an ad-powered platform doesn’t like your speech, they will actively prevent you from using their services even if the products and services you are offering are broadly represented by other companies who also use their ad services.

Such forms of censorship may violate federal law's protections of the right to engage in commerce without interference.

Shadow banning

Shadow banning, discussed in some detail earlier, is a deceptive censorship tactic that gives the originator of content the false impression that their content was distributed to their full base of followers. In reality, the content is secretly banned for most users, and delivery only takes place to a tiny fraction of the followers who normally expect to receive such information.

Facebook is infamous for shadow banning selected publishers it does not like. Natural News, for example, has over two million followers, but a typical post will only be allowed to reach a few hundred followers (greater than 99.9% shadow ban rate).

Outright banning / Deplatforming

Outright banning means “deplatforming” a publisher or individual. This is a full banning of their account. Notably, CNN, which has experienced a large drop of its U.S. audience since the 2016 election, is aggressively lobbying Facebook to deplatform Infowars. CNN apparently sees no conflict of interest in such a demand, even though InfoWars is a clear competitor in the news space in which CNN pretends to operate.

Black box search results algorithm tweaking

Search engines and search engine components (such as the on-site search on YouTube) may achieve additional selective censorship of political targets by engaging in “black box algorithmic” banning via search results. When users enter a search term, particular websites or channels which are not liked by Google, Facebook, Twitter, etc., may be *selectively and secretly penalized* in the algorithm, ensuring that they are artificially moved down the list of search results to the point of being nearly invisible.

Because search algorithms are black box affairs with zero public transparency, no website operator or publisher has any practical way to know whether they are being “black boxed,” nor can they determine the degree to which such bias is being leveled against them in a punitive way. Many suspect that Google maintains a list of specific domains to penalize in the news space, and that such news websites are heavily penalized in all Google search results, regardless of the merit of their journalistic reporting.

While Google claims that its search results are driven entirely by algorithms, Natural News experienced firsthand a shocking example of being wholly blacklisted by Google in 2017, when Google fabricated a fictitious justification for banning the entire website, falsely claiming that a single third-party ad on one blogger-written article hosted on a subdomain (blogs.naturalnews.com) violated Google’s terms of service and therefore justified the complete de-listing of the entire root domain and all pages (over 140,000 pages). (<https://www.naturalnews.com/2017-02-22-google-blacklists-natural-news-removes-140000-pages-from-its-index-memory-holes-natural-news-investigative-articles.html>)

Google further claimed that independent bloggers who independently contributed to the Natural News “blogs” subdomain were, in some cases, violating Natural News journalistic standards by covertly selling outbound links to publicity seekers. Natural News was able to document that the exact same activity was taking place on BuzzFeed, Forbes, CNN and the Huffington Post, yet Google never outright banned or penalized any of those websites, proving that Google’s enforcement of its own policies is rooted in subjective bias rather than fairness or equality. (<https://www.naturalnews.com/2017-02-25-after-blacklisting-natural-news-google-takes-no-such-action-against-huffpo-buzzfeed-forbes-and-cnn-for-writers-selling-outbound-links-in-violation-of-webmaster-guidelines.html>)

Email interference

Email newsletter suppression is also discussed above. It consists of email ISPs (namely Gmail and Yahoo Mail) selectively blocking the delivery of email newsletters and other communications from publishers they don’t like.

In a tech-driven society, this is akin to stealing and destroying the postal mail of your neighbors merely because you hate their politics, yet Google and Yahoo pursue these malicious actions on a daily basis, without any apparent repercussions.

Outsourcing censorship

In order to achieve aggressive censorship goals without implementing such censorship via internal policies, nearly all tech giants outsource their censorship to third-party organizations, almost all of which have their own history of errors and extreme bias. The primary organizations currently employed as “censorship outsourcing” centers are:

- Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC), a radical left-wing activism group that routinely labels Christian and Bible groups “hate groups.”
- SNOPEs, a widely discredited “fact-checking” organization run by extreme left-wing activists who appear to care more about political influence than credible facts.
- Politifact, similar to SNOPEs in terms of its lack of credibility but far more organized and well-funded. Politifact renders the majority of its decisions in favor of Democrats and has been repeatedly caught applying self-contradictory “rules” in a highly subjective way, depending on which political party might benefit from any given decision.
- Wikipedia, an anonymous “trolling” encyclopedia run by a multitude of tribal trolls, each with their own political or corporate agenda. Wikipedia, notably, has zero accountability and no pragmatic quality control process whatsoever, yet Google and other search engines almost universally cite Wikipedia as a credible source on nearly everything.

By outsourcing censorship tasks to radical left-wing organizations, tech giants like YouTube and Facebook can legitimately claim they aren’t censoring anyone for political speech. It’s the third-party groups that are doing it with the consent of YouTube, you see.

Propaganda / psychological methods of censoring independent news publishers

In addition to technical methods of censorship, both tech giants and media monopolists engage in a number of extremely damaging psychological censorship methods which are designed to destroy their intended targets.

- Doubt interrupts
- Character assassination / reputation destruction
- Fake news / hate speech accusations
- Intimidation of personnel

Doubt interrupts

A “doubt interrupt” is an interruption of the user experience by the internet gatekeeper, taking place immediately after an end user attempts to click on or share a URL from an independent news website which has been targeted for censorship. Typically, a warning message or pop-up will appear to the user, all for the purpose of creating doubt in the mind of the user. Such messages may warn the user about the link in question containing “malicious code” (even when it doesn’t) or consisting of “fake news” (a scurrilous, subjective claim).

These “doubt interrupts” allow internet gatekeepers to suppress the sharing or discovery of content without technically banning such content. It’s much like going grocery shopping with a friend, and every time you reach for a product on the shelf, your friend says, “Oh man, I don’t know about that one, I’d think twice before buying that.” The **engineering of doubt** is a very effective psychological propaganda weapon now being widely deployed in the censorship war.

Doubt interrupts rely on “trusted flaggers”—third party censors which are selected precisely for their left-wing bias—to flag particular URLs or web domains for such interruption

warning messages. It is widely believed that Google may be about to integrate “doubt interrupts” into the Chrome browser itself, which would flag websites as “untrusted” when a user attempts to visit that site. The source of this list, of course, would be a biased, unethical, left-leaning organization such as the SPLC.

Character assassination / reputation destruction

When outright censorship isn’t enough to destroy a targeted independent news publisher, a psychological warfare tactic known as “character assassination” is often invoked to create doubt in the minds of would-be followers.

Character assassination is frequently carried out by a combination of left-wing media monopolists (like CNN), late-night comedy shows (Jimmy Kimmel, Stephen Colbert, etc.) and Wikipedia trolls, who populate the targeted Wikipedia page with false and defamatory information targeting the mark.

The classic example of character assassination taking place today is the coordinated, widespread character attack on Alex Jones, which has involved media monopolists literally attempting to offer cash rewards to former employees and associates of Jones if they would go public with any accusations, true or otherwise, which could be used to smear Jones.

The key element in character assassination, as practiced by organized media monopolists, is to make the accusations as outrageous and memorable as possible so that even if a small retraction is later forced to be made, the original imagery of the accusation remains firmly fixed in the minds of the public. This is precisely why character smear attempts are deliberately laced with very specific, vulgar imagery that is nearly impossible to erase from consciousness, even if the original accusation is retracted.

The claim, for example, that “Alex Jones hires people who wear Nazi symbols on their shoes” is a lot more memorable and specific than merely saying, “Alex Jones is a bad person.” (For

the record, I've been in the InfoWars studios many times and I've never seen a Nazi symbol anywhere. But that didn't stop the UK Daily Mail from making similarly outrageous and false claims about InfoWars, all filled with truly bizarre, imaginary accusations.)

“Fake news” / “hate speech” accusations

The accusation of “fake news” or “hate speech” is fully covered elsewhere in this document. The purpose of such accusations is to paint the targeted publisher with a dishonest reputation, calling into question everything they publish, even if the vast majority of their news reporting is factual and reflective of high quality journalism standards.

Intimidation of personnel

Independent news publishers are further subjected to coordinate oppression attempts through the intimidation of their staff members, including writers. Indy media writers are routinely threatened, harassed and smeared by coordinated trolls which are empowered by character assassination attacks, “fact check” smear campaigns and other tactics openly pursued by media monopolists such as CNN.

For this reason, the vast majority of writers who publish on independent media websites today use pen names for their own protection. Similarly, most email addresses used by staffers who work for indy media publishers are also based on pen names rather than real names. The importance of this protective strategy is further underscored by the increasing frequency of “doxxing” attacks by hysterical Leftists, who routinely publish the names and home addresses of their targeted enemies, often alongside direct calls for violence or stalking behavior against such persons.

The future of the internet: Only one “official” opinion will be allowed for each topic of discussion

In essence, the combination of censorship, suppression, intimidation and other tactics will, if not stopped, lead to a future internet where only one “official” opinion is allowed for any given topic of discussion.

Any publishers deviating from that official opinion will be blacklisted, shadow banned or otherwise disconnected from the internet and its marketplace of ideas.

The “official” opinion, of course, will be decided by the internet gatekeepers whose own leaders and employees tend to represent the radical Left wing of politics, fronting increasingly irrational and indefensible ideas as “truths” such as the absurd idea that any nation which protects its own border is inherently racist and evil. Imagine surfing the internet in a world where no dissenting views or original thoughts of any kind are tolerated by internet gatekeepers, and where China-style “social scores” are tracked for individual users, granting them influence and power in accordance with how closely they promote the “official” opinions of the gatekeepers. Astonishingly, Google, Facebook and other tech giants are rapidly and deliberately maneuvering the online world into precisely such a dystopian trap, all in the name of “equality” and “inclusiveness,” no less.

The monopolist media is, quite disturbingly, cheering it on.

Imagine surfing the web in America and receiving a penalty to your “social score” for visiting websites flagged as “untrusted” by the media monopolists.

When CNN demands that Facebook deplatform InfoWars, what CNN is really asserting is the idea that no opinions may be allowed to exist on the ‘net at all if they do not wholeheartedly agree with CNN’s views, however absurd or deceptive they may be. This assertion runs counter to the very freedom to think, and it smacks of a dangerous tilt toward authoritarianism that’s now being strongly advocated among Left-leaning institutions which are panicked about the fact that they have lost control over the narratives which determine “reality” in a hyper-connected society.

In their panic, they are demanding what is essentially an “off with their heads” response to any competing news publishers they cannot control. **Being deplatformed is the online equivalent of being executed**, and that is precisely why CNN is calling for it... because it is a form of extreme virtual violence which forever silences intended targets.

Summary of Part Five:

- Internet gatekeepers rely on a vast array of technical censorship tools to oppress, punish or eliminate their intended targets (usually independent media websites).
- Some of the censorship tools operate covertly so that the very targets being censored are not easily aware of the censorship taking place.
- Tech giants routinely outsource censorship tasks to extreme left-wing activist groups so that responsibility for censorship decisions is shifted to a third party.
- Tech giants and media monopolists use a variety of psychological warfare tools to augment their technical censorship tactics.
- If the extreme censorship now being carried out across the internet is not halted, the future internet will only allow a single “official” opinion to be discussed or shared on any given topic. No debate will be allowed, and no dissenting views will be tolerated.

Part Six: Legislative and Regulatory Solutions to Techno-Tyranny

Legislative and regulatory solutions for halting the censorship of independent media

The United States government has a compelling interest in preserving the marketplace of free ideas, even when those ideas are unpopular or consist of criticism against the government itself.

To accomplish this goal, the United States Congress must act with urgent legislation, and relevant regulators (FCC, FTC) must assert regulatory oversight that protects a fair and free marketplace of ideas across the ‘net. We need, in other words, an “Internet Freedom Act.”

Below, I list some suggestions of possible legislative or regulatory strategies that may be worthy of further exploration for protecting the “online dignity” of Americans. In terms of naming these laws, terms and phrases that might be useful include:

- Online Bill of Rights
- The Online Dignity Act
- The Right to Exist Online Act
- The Internet Freedom Act
- The Online Human Rights Act

Here are some suggested legislative and regulatory solutions that may be worthy of additional exploration:

1) DECLARE THE DOMINANT ONLINE PLATFORMS OF SPEECH TO BE “PUBLIC COMMONS” COMMUNICATIONS INFRASTRUCTURE, ESSENTIAL FOR INDIVIDUAL PARTICIPATION IN MODERN SOCIETY

When an online platform reaches over 50% market penetration in its appropriate sector (such as social media, search, videos, etc.) it should be deemed an “essential service” for the public at large, making it subject to laws and regulations that prohibit discriminatory censorship.

2) OUTLAW THE CENSORING OF CONTENT BASED ON POLITICAL VIEWS OR “UNPOPULAR” VIEWS ON SCIENCE, MEDICINE, HISTORY AND RELIGION

As part of the legislative and regulatory reforms that are needed today, lawmakers should specifically name content areas (subject matter) which are protected by those laws. Protected topics must include politics, science, medicine, history, religion, sexuality and others.

3) REQUIRE INTERNET GATEKEEPERS TO OPEN ALL THEIR BLACK BOXES AND PUBLISH THEIR RANKING ALGORITHMS

To halt the “voodoo” black box algorithm tweaking that artificially boosts left-wing news publishers while punishing conservative or independent sites, dominant search engines, video platforms and social media platforms must publicly disclose their ranking algorithms, feed broadcast algorithms and other internal engines which determine public visibility of content.

4) REQUIRE TECH GIANTS TO PUBLICLY DISCLOSE THEIR CENSORSHIP, DEPLATFORMING AND DOWN-RANKING CONTENT POLICIES

If tech giants are going to ban content creators for expressing conservative ideas, such companies must publicly and unambiguously disclose that this is their policy. Rather than hiding behind the false justifications of “hate speech” or “fake news,” tech giants must be honest about naming the philosophies and ideas they are going to ban.

For example, YouTube must publicly state that it does not allow videos promoting CBD or medicinal hemp. Facebook must state that pro-Trump speech will be banned. And Twitter must state that if you issue death threats to people while being a conservative, you will be banned, but if you issue death threats while being a liberal, such attacks will be openly tolerated.

5) FINE INTERNET GATEKEEPERS FOR COMMITTING SELECTIVE, POLITICALLY-MOTIVATED CENSORSHIP

Enact laws that allow the FTC or FCC to issue large fines when dominant tech giants engage in politically-motivated censorship. Such fines should start at \$1 billion and go up from there.

6) INVOKE RICO ACT INDICTMENTS AND PROSECUTIONS AGAINST FACEBOOK, ALPHABET AND OTHER INTERNET GATEKEEPERS FOR WAGING MAFIA-STYLE CAMPAIGNS OF INTIMIDATION AND OPPRESSION

On the law enforcement side, Facebook and other tech giants are already engaged in racketeering activities which could be prosecuted under existing law. This would, of course, first require reestablishing the importance of the rule of law at both the FBI and DOJ. Perhaps Robert Mueller should drop the issue of Russian jokers and instead take up the investigation of American tech traitors.

7) SEEK CRIMINAL INDICTMENTS AGAINST FACEBOOK, GOOGLE, YOUTUBE AND TWITTER FOR INTERFERING IN THE 2018 ELECTIONS AND COMMITTING WHAT ROBERT MUELLER CALLS A “CONSPIRACY TO DEFRAUD THE UNITED STATE OF AMERICA”

Robert Mueller charged a Russian company with attempting to defraud the United States of America by running ads on Facebook. Yet what Facebook itself does to silence conservative voices across America is a far more serious attempt to defraud America and sway

elections. By silencing conservative voices in a coordinated, malicious campaign, tech giants are right now attempting to “steal” the 2018 mid-term elections.

8) PASS LAWS THAT ALLOW INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE BEEN CENSORED FOR POLITICAL REASONS TO SUE THE DOMINANT ONLINE PLATFORMS FOR ACTUAL DAMAGES AND PUNITIVE DAMAGES

One way to halt online censorship by tech giants is to make it financially unwise for them to engage in such actions. This can be achieved by passing laws that allow the victims of censorship—whose personal lives, professional lives and small businesses have been destroyed—to sue the tech giants for damages.

9) REQUIRE INTERNET GATEKEEPERS TO BE TRANSPARENT ABOUT SHADOW BANNING, CONTENT BANNING AND ACCOUNT BANNING

When online platforms engage in shadow banning, they must be transparent with content creators about the extent of that ban. Instead of “secret” bans—which are equivalent to a secret court—tech giants must be transparent about their algorithms, bans and content down-ranking activities.

10) REQUIRE INTERNET GATEKEEPERS TO FOLLOW A TRANSPARENT DUE PROCESS PROCEDURE THAT ALLOWS CONTENT CREATORS TO APPEAL CENSORSHIP DECISIONS

Content creators are currently denied due process by tech giants, who secretly decide punishments completely outside anything resembling due process. This must change, and a process must be created that allows content creators to present evidence in their defense, achieve “discovery” of claims against them, appeal censorship decisions and pursue other customary rules of legal representation. No more secret Google courts.

11) SET UP AN INDEPENDENT ARBITRATION COMMISSION THAT ISSUES BINDING DECISIONS ON CENSORSHIP GRIEVANCES BROUGHT BY INDEPENDENT PUBLISHERS AND CONTENT CREATORS

Another worthy idea is to create an independent arbitration commission that hears all censorship / deplatforming / shadow banning cases, and to which Google, Facebook, YouTube and other tech giants must confer authority. Content creators would have the right to participate in the proceedings while offering evidence in their defense. Costs for arbitration would be paid by the loser.

Under this system, if a tech giant wished to ban someone, they would have to file a case with the third party arbitration organization which would alert the user to the case so that they could appear in their defense. No bans could be carried out without the decision authority of the arbitration entity, and all decisions would be openly published for public review.

A similar procedure is currently in place regarding domain name intellectual property disputes.

12) OUTLAW EMAIL ISPs FROM INTERFERING WITH THE DELIVERY OF EMAIL THAT HAS BEEN REQUESTED BY END USERS

Just as it is currently illegal for individuals or organizations to interfere with the delivery of the U.S. mail, it should also be illegal for ISPs (such as gmail) to interfere with the delivery of email that is requested by the end user. The ongoing interference of email newsletter delivery is an insidious form of selective censorship.

13) BREAK UP GOOGLE, FACEBOOK, TWITTER AND OTHER TECH GIANTS UNDER ANTITRUST LEGISLATION

If the U.S. government has the authority to break up Standard Oil and AT&T, it also has the authority to break up monopolies in the online space. The extreme, monopolistic

abuse of power now routinely demonstrated by Google, Facebook and other tech giants is providing clear justification for antitrust legal action that would end the monopolies and decentralize the tech gatekeepers.

End user actions to break the tech giants' monopolies

End users also play a role in taking back their power from tech monopolists.

End users may:

1) Migrate to alternative platforms - Seek alternatives to Google, YouTube, Facebook and other dominant tech giants.

2) Build alternative platforms - Construct and launch decentralized, non-corporate-controlled platforms which respect freedom of expression.

Summary of Part Six:

- Legislative and regulatory solutions must be explored that can reel in the extreme abuse of monopoly power currently being exploited by tech giants to censor voices they don't like.
- Existing law already provides justification under the RICO Act (racketeering) to criminally indict executives of Google, Facebook and other tech giants.
- One possible solution to censorship might be the creation of an authoritative, independent arbitration commission that would hear cases and issue binding decisions, all with public oversight.
- End users may help fight back against tech monopolies by seeking out or building alternative platforms.

About the Author

Mike Adams is one of the leading independent media publishers on the 'net and operates over 350 unique websites, including Trump.news, Censored.news and NaturalNews.com. Having been repeatedly censored and outright banned by YouTube, Google and Facebook, Adams recently launched a YouTube alternative video platform called REAL.video.

Adams is a laboratory scientist and is the co-author of a published science paper detailing the discovery of a new method for the accurate quantitation of cannabinoid molecules using mass spectrometry (<http://www.chromatographyonline.com/liquid-chromatography-time-flight-mass-spectrometry-cannabinoid-profiling-and-quantitation-hemp-oil>). He's the author of Food Forensics (FoodForensics.com), a No. 1 Amazon.com science book, and has received numerous awards for independent journalism.

Adams' online store, HealthRangerStore.com, is a USDA-certified organic food manufacturing facility and fulfillment center based in Texas. Using mass spec laboratory analysis, Adams manufactures and retails lab-verified foods, supplements, superfoods and personal care products to a niche audience of health-conscious individuals who demand ultra-clean products. Adams is a vocal critic of the pharmaceutical industry, Monsanto and the biotech industry, government corruption and left-wing politics.

Having lived in Taiwan and South America, Adams is conversant in Mandarin Chinese and Spanish languages. He is trained to fly small aircraft and has two patents to his name, including a patent for the invention of an emergency dietary supplement that eliminates radioactive cesium-137 from the body. That patent, called "Cesium Eliminator," was granted approval by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office in 2016. (<https://patents.google.com/patent/US9526751B2/>). Adams has publicly stated his willingness to donate 10,000kg of the formula to state or federal emergency responders in the case of a nuclear event on U.S. soil.

Adams is also the inventor of the Food Rising Mini-Farm Grow Box (FoodRising.org) and

used 3D CAD software to design the 3D-printed parts used in the system. Over a hundred such systems were donated to schools across America to teach children food self-reliance.

Along with nearly every other prominent truth teller in America today, Adams has been subjected to a well-funded and organized campaign of smears, defamation and character assassination consisting of the deliberate publication of fabricated falsehoods intended to destroy his reputation. Labeled a “conspiracy theorist,” Adams is actually a scientifically-trained analyst of reality and is well known for filming and broadcasting a “forensic acoustics analysis” of the Las Vegas shooting which scientifically proved the existence of multiple shooters through simple math and physics. That 29-minute science video, which astonished the internet and humbled law enforcement investigators, is available at <https://vimeo.com/237467538>

Adams resides in Texas and voted for President Trump. He currently has a show called “Counterthink” which airs each week on the InfoWars network (InfoWars.com). He recently produced a firearms combat video series called “REAL Self-Defense,” featuring firearms instructors from the U.S. Navy SEALs and United States Marines (<https://www.natural-news.com/2018-07-13-real-video-launches-self-defense-how-to-gun-training-series-featuring-former-navy-seal-and-u-s-marine-combat-instructor.html>). Adams supports local law enforcement, veterans and the United States military. He is highly trained in hand-to-hand combat, tactical combat firearms deployment and long-range target shooting.

Adams is available to brief members of Congress or Trump administration staffers on any subject covered in this report. He has no interest in speaking to media monopolists and will not respond to such contact requests.