



Google: None Dare Call It Seditious

Google has now flatly stated its intent to influence and control public perception so as to manipulate and determine national political election outcomes. It does this by using AI algorithms to skew search results, presenting only their political views, and suppressing dissenting or alternative views.

However, this is not a free speech issue. Google is not a news organization. It does not hire journalists nor does it create original content. Rather, Google is an information utility that simply indexes existing and new journalistic content.

Google's all-powerful and pervasive Internet crawler is able to discover virtually 100% of everything published in the world, on an hour-by-hour or minute-by-minute basis. In other words, Google knows everything there is to know. The question is, will it tell all that it knows or only part

of it?

Google is very much a public utility that resembles a telephone company. When your local telephone company publishes a phone book, it simply indexes people by last name and puts their number next to it. It is easy for one person to find another and then pick up the phone and make a call.

What would happen if the phone company started making decisions about who could have a listing in their master directory? What if they simply dropped out people who were discovered to be Republicans or Democrats? What if they deleted people because they had a certain skin color? Or national origin? Or religion?

While on one hand, the phone company was willing to connect and charge for service in everybody's home, those suppressed individuals would only be able to make outbound calls and they would seldom receive any inbound calls.

Would America ever tolerate this? Of course not. In fact, it would spark a national uproar of epic proportions.

So, can anyone explain why Google is getting a free pass on hiding the particulars of its indexing algorithms from public consumers of information?

It would be bad enough if Google simply dropped out certain pieces of information, but they have gone way beyond this by rearranging the results it chooses to release and presenting them in such a manner to show an alternate reality that purposely misleads the public.

This is what is called "weaponizing data" to actively and intentionally lead people to false conclusions in order to modify their behavior. To say this is wrong is an understatement. To say it is illegal is complicated, but it is certainly possible.

Has Google unleashed Project Dragonfly?

On August 1, 2018, the left-leaning journal called *The Intercept* originally [broke the story](#) that Google was creating a censored version of its search engine for China. The secret project was named *Dragonfly*.

The U.K. journalist, Ryan Gallagher, created an international uproar with the first report, but has since written 23 additional investigative articles that fully expose Google's activities in China.

Gallagher wrote,

Documents seen by The Intercept, marked "Google confidential," say that Google's Chinese search app will automatically identify and filter websites blocked by the Great Firewall. When a person carries out a search, banned websites will be removed from the first page of results... The search app will also "blacklist sensitive queries" so that "no results will be shown" at all when people enter certain words or phrases, the documents state. The censorship will apply across the platform: Google's image search, automatic spell check and suggested search features will incorporate the blacklists, meaning that they will not recommend people information or photographs the government has banned.

This is exactly what Google is now doing to the United States, except that it is acting on its own accord and not under the orders of a national government.

Ex-Google CEO Eric Schmidt, a member of the elitist Trilateral Commission, was recently [interviewed](#) by BBC Newsnight's Emily Maitlis and stated,

"The world is a very interconnected place. There are many, many benefits interacting, among other things, with China... I believed they would be better to stay in China, and help change China to be more open."

Apparently, what is good for China's censorship is good for the U.S. as well.

Will *The Intercept* call out Google for doing to the U.S. what it intended to do for China? Will the American public be as outraged over domestic censorship as they were about the possibility of China's censorship?

Google's clear agenda

When Google's Head of Responsible Innovation, Jen Gennai stated,

Again it wasn't just us, it was, the people got screwed over, the news media got screwed over, like, everybody got screwed over so we're rapidly been like, what happened there and how do we prevent it from happening again?

What does Google want to prevent from happening again? According to Gennai, it is ***“preventing the next Trump situation.”***

Social justice warriors like Gennai have obviously discovered the power of Google's Internet machine to practice social engineering according to their exclusive world view, while excluding all other views.

While some lawmakers are already investigating anti-trust measures against Google, they might be missing the more pertinent issue: *Sedition*.

According to one legal [source](#),

Sedition is a serious felony punishable by fines and up to 20 years in prison and it refers to the act of inciting revolt or violence against a lawful authority with the goal of destroying or overthrowing it.

Whether they realize it or not, Google is deep into the process of meddling with the election process to create insurrection in order to cause the overthrow of our lawful national government established according to the U.S. Constitution. In short, it is the citizens of our nation who decide national, state and local leadership and not Google!

Virtually every public servant in the United States is required to take an oath to defend and uphold the Constitution of the United States. It's time to hold some feet to the fire.



Big Tech Asks For More Self-Regulation That Never Worked Anyway

Big Tech created the unmanageable platforms that have created nationwide chaos, but now they want us to trust them yet again to fix the impossible. This won't ever work. □ TN Editor

Social media giants have responded to mounting pressure from politicians and activist groups. These social media firms are now refereeing content of the angry, polarizing and downright crazy public space those giants themselves created. These platforms are private entities, so they can officiate pretty much as they please. The trick now is for Facebook, YouTube, Twitter and the others to conduct their cleansing operations in ways that are transparent and sensible.

Good luck with that.

It's more likely Mark Zuckerberg will start wearing bowties.

No doubt, there is a ton of hostile and false nonsense floating around on these sites. The tech giants created these platforms as open forums, so they had to know these sites would attract all kinds of bizarre content, some of it crossing the line into the outrageous. That didn't seem to bother the tech entrepreneurs over the years, as social media firmly implanted itself into the culture. The tech superstars got rich and famous while society careened into a ravine of harebrained technological determinism.

Now the social media leaders feel compelled to convince the nation they can responsibly manage the unmanageable. Their actions are not so much philanthropic as they are self-preservative. If they were such nice guys, they would have paid more attention to the toxicity as it grew over the years. Now, in response to Congressional anger and pressure for community censorship from cyber mobs, the executives at Facebook, YouTube and Twitter want to act all righteous by deplatforming provocateurs.

Nobody should feel sympathy for the deplatformed purveyors of conspiracies, falsehoods and anger. Society needs a higher quality of deliberation than what these volatile voices promote. The issue here is whether stifling expression even of the unhinged really serves to further the cause of free society. The nation's founders created a First Amendment to keep the government from shutting people up. Having self-serving tech giants shutting people up is hardly the alternative envisioned by the constitutional framers.

A key consideration is whether big tech's efforts to silence radical voices can work. The leaders of uncivil movements will hardly be deterred because they get tossed from a social media platform. If anything, their radical causes have been boosted because of the attention brought by the social media purges.

The magnitude of trying to scrub social media of all hostile rhetoric is also worth considering. Taking down some high profile extremists looks good for public relations purposes, but countless other shrill voices

surely remain in the social media sphere. The social media world, even with all of its technical wizardry, can hardly sanitize all of the crazy material out there. This might well be an unwinnable game of whack-a-mole.

[Read full story here...](#)



Leaked: How Facebook Determines 'Hate Agent' Status

The reason that Big Tech censorship seems so disjointed is because it is. Facebook gathers data about you from online and offline sources, determines all your associations, what posts you share, who you

interview, who you 'Like' and then slaps you with a hate score. Once tagged as a 'Hate Agent', the designation will blacklist you for years to come. Once shared with other Big Tech companies, your blacklisting will become universal. □ TN Editor

Facebook monitors the offline behavior of its users to determine if they should be categorized as a "Hate Agent," according to a document provided exclusively to Breitbart News by a source within the social media giant.

The document, titled "Hate Agent Policy Review" outlines a series of "signals" that Facebook uses to determine if someone ought to be categorized as a "hate agent" and banned from the platform.

Those signals include a wide range of on- and off-platform behavior. If you praise the wrong individual, interview them, or appear at events alongside them, Facebook may categorize you as a "hate agent."

Facebook may also categorize you as a hate agent if you self-identify with or advocate for a "Designated Hateful Ideology," if you associate with a "Designated Hate Entity" (one of the examples cited by Facebook as a "hate entity" includes Islam critic Tommy Robinson), or if you have "tattoos of hate symbols or hate slogans." (The document cites no examples of these, but the media and "anti-racism" advocacy groups increasingly label innocuous items as "hate symbols," including a [cartoon frog](#) and the "[OK](#)" hand sign.)

Facebook will also categorize you as a hate agent for possession of "hate paraphernalia," although the document provides no examples of what falls into this category.

The document also says Facebook will categorize you as a hate agent for "statements made in private but later made public." Of course, Facebook holds vast amounts of information on what you say in public *and* in private — and as we saw with the *Daily Beast* doxing story, the platform will [publicize](#) private information on their users to assist the media in hitjobs on regular American citizens.

Breitbart News has already covered some of the individuals that Facebook placed on its list of potential "hate agents." Paul Joseph

Watson eventually was categorized as “hateful” and banned from the platform, in part, according to the document, because he praised Tommy Robinson and interviewed him on his YouTube channel. Star conservative pundit [Candace Owens](#) and conservative author and terrorism expert [Brigitte Gabriel](#) were also on the list, as were [British politicians](#) Carl Benjamin and Anne Marie Waters.

The Benjamin addition reveals that Facebook may categorize you as a hate agent merely for speaking neutrally about individuals and organizations that the social network considers hateful. In the document, Facebook tags Benjamin with a “hate agent” signal for “neutral representation of John Kinsman, member of Proud Boys” on October 21 last year.

Facebook also accuses Benjamin, a classical liberal and critic of identity politics, as “representing the ideology of an ethnostate” for a [post](#) in which he calls out an actual advocate of an ethnostate.

In addition to the more unorthodox signals that Facebook uses to determine if its users are “hate agents,” there is also, predictably, “hate speech.” Facebook divides hate speech into [three tiers](#) depending on severity and considers attacks on a person’s “immigration status” to be hate speech.

Here’s how “hate speech” — both on and off Facebook — will be categorized by the platform, according to the document:

Individual has made public statements, or statements made in private and later made public, using Tier 1, 2, or 3 hate speech or slurs:

3 instances in one statement or appearance = signal

5 instances in multiple statements or appearances over one month = signal

If you’ve done this within the past two years, Facebook will consider it a hate signal.

[Read full story here...](#)



Chinese City Pays \$1,500 To Snitch On Christians

In a scientifically engineered society like China, Technocrats cannot tolerate any fundamental ideology that refuses to be molded into the uniform system. Thus, dissent is crushed, one way or another. □ TN Editor

The Chinese government is increasing its crackdown on Christians by actually [rewarding citizens](#) that report Christians to the government.

Guangzhou has become the first city to offer up to \$1,500 USD to any Chinese citizen that reports “illegal religious activities,” like underground churches or Bible studies, which was recently announced by their ethnic and religious affairs department.

According to the [South China Morning Post](#), the city’s crackdown has

come down hardest on unregistered Protestant churches. The government has also demolished Catholic churches, Buddhist temples and Muslim mosques that were not government-approved.

Not only can informants earn between 5,000 and 10,000 Chinese yuan for reporting a religious leader who is not Chinese, but they can also receive 3,000 to 5,000 yuan for reporting a foreign religious group, and 100 to 3,000 yuan for reporting local religious gatherings.

Ying Fuk-Tsang, who is the director of the Divinity School of Chung Chi College at the Chinese University of Hong Kong, said the crackdown is more common than people think and allows for strict social control.

“This will compress the survival space of house churches,” he told the Morning Post. “Not only will they have to deal with the official crackdown but now also the threat from their neighbors.”

The path to sinicization

Over the past year, the Chinese government has cracked down on Christian practices, while giving more freedom to grassroots officials to implement their own power over religious practitioners, shutting down small religious gatherings and implementing strong penalties against Christians.

As [Faithwire](#) previously reported, in January, a document was issued to a city in the Shanxi Province by the Bureau of Ethnic and Religious Affairs that would regulate “church-free zones” near Chinese schools.

The plan, officially known as the “Implementation Plan on the Special Governance of Private Christian Gathering Sites,” not only created mandatory “church-free zones,” but also required churches to give the names of youth members to the local government.

The city in the Shanxi Province was not the only one affected by this ruling, as a similar document was issued to the Henan Province. It reads, in part:

All private Christian gathering sites around universities and

colleges, as well as on-campus activity sites, are to be shut down in accordance with the law. Criticism and [re]education of participating teachers and students is to be carried out by the school authorities.

In September, the Chinese State Administration for Religious Affairs (SARA) proposed legislation to further regulate Christian activity on their already regulated internet, [Christianity Today](#) reported.

This type of law would prohibit things like online church services, which would be detrimental to Christians in China who already have extremely limited opportunities to hear the Word of God.

In [August 2018](#), Radio Free Asia, a group that tracks and follows free speech in Asia, reported that the Christians in China were facing the “most systematic suppression of Christianity in China since religious freedom was written into the constitution in 1982.”

[Read full story here...](#)

See also: [China on course to become ‘world’s most Christian nation’ within 15 years](#)

governments watched enviously the emergence of Chinese corporate titans from Tencent Holdings Ltd. to Alibaba Group Holding Ltd. — in spite of draconian online curbs. And now they want the same.

The more free-wheeling Silicon Valley model once seemed unquestionably the best approach, with stars from Google to Facebook to vouch for its superiority. Now, a re-molding of the internet into a tightly controlled and scrubbed sphere in China's image is taking place from Russia to India. Yet it's Southeast Asia that's the economic and geopolitical linchpin to Chinese ambitions and where U.S.-Chinese tensions will come to a head: a region home to more than half a billion people whose internet economy is expected to triple to \$240 billion by 2025.

“For authoritarian countries in general, the idea of the state being able to wall off to some extent its internet is deeply appealing,” said Howard French, author of “Everything Under the Heavens: How the Past Helps Shape China's Push for Global Power. “This is about the regimes' survival in an authoritarian situation. So that's why they like to do this. They want to be able to insulate themselves against shocks.”

The Chinese model is gaining traction just as the American one comes under fire. Facebook and Twitter were used to manipulate the 2016 U.S. election, YouTube was criticized for failing to detect child porn, and American social media allowed a gunman to live-stream the worst mass shooting in New Zealand's history for 10 minutes or more before severing it. Against the backdrop of wider fears about U.S. social media failings, Beijing's approach now seems a reasonable alternative, or reasonable enough that self-serving governments can justify its adoption.

Vietnam's controversial version went into effect Jan. 1 — a law BSA/The Software Alliance, which counts Apple Inc. and Microsoft Corp. among its members — called chilling and ineffectual. Indonesia, the region's largest economy, already requires data be stored locally. The Philippines has stepped up what critics call a media crackdown, arrested the head of media outlet Rappler Inc. after it grew critical of President Rodrigo Duterte. And last year, the government of former Malaysian Prime

Minister Najib Razak introduced a fake news law used to probe his chief opponent, though the current government may yet repeal it.

One of the latest to buy into the rationale is Thailand, which on Feb. 28 passed a cyber security bill modeled on China's that grants the government the right to seize data and electronic equipment without a court order in the interests of national security. Introduced just weeks ahead of Thailand's first democratic election since a 2014 military coup, it stoked concerns it could be used to stifle dissent, though the government says it shouldn't affect companies "with good conduct." The Asia Internet Coalition, an organization that groups the likes of Alphabet Inc.'s Google, Amazon.com Inc., Facebook Inc. and Twitter Inc., condemned a bill Amnesty International warns could be used to "cage the internet."

The crux of a Chinese internet model is data sovereignty: information of citizens must be stored in-country and accessible on demand to the authorities, a concept enshrined in Chinese law since 2017. That's raising hackles in Washington, which aims to counter Beijing's sway — a longer-term struggle that may be the single most important episode in world affairs since the collapse of the Soviet Union. Escalating tensions between the two richest economies will impact just about every country across the planet — economically and socially.

[Read full story here...](#)



Breaking Up? Internet Imperiled By New Regulations

Nations are passing laws that conflict with other nations and the result will be 'nationalized data' similar to the Ministry of Truth in George Orwell's dystopian book, Nineteen Eighty Four. Further splintering of the Internet is inevitable. □ TN Editor

Is the dream of one global internet still alive?

Increasingly, moves by governments to filter and restrict content are threatening to fragment the system created with the promise of connecting the world with a largely unified body of content.

China for years has walled off some western services, and the fragmentation may be accelerating with regulations being imposed elsewhere, say analysts.

This is leading to a "splinternet," a term circulated for a decade or more but gaining more traction in recent months.

"The internet is already fragmented in material ways, but each regulator

around the world thinks they know how to fix the internet,” said Eric Goldman, director of the High Tech Law Institute at Santa Clara University.

“I think we will see a tsunami of regulations that will lead to a further splintering of the internet.”

The New Zealand Christchurch mosques massacre livestreamed online heightened the sense of urgency in some countries, with debates in the US and EU on curbing incitement to violence.

A new Australian law could jail social media executives for failing to take down violent extremist content quickly.

And a proposal unveiled in Britain could make executives personally liable for harmful content posted on social platforms. Similar ideas have been discussed by lawmakers in Washington.

These moves come as Facebook chief Mark Zuckerberg has called for a “common global framework” of internet rules.

But free-speech defenders warn it would be dangerous to allow governments to regulate online content, even if social media are struggling.

The UK proposal “is a very bad look for a rights-respecting democracy,” said R. David Edelman, a former White House technology adviser who now heads the Massachusetts Institute of Technology’s project on technology, the economy and national security.

“It would place the UK toward the far end of the internet censorship spectrum.”

Elsewhere, critics pounced on a bill in Singapore to ban “fake news,” calling it a thinly veiled attempt at censorship.

“It is not up to the government to arbitrarily determine what is and is not true,” said Daniel Bastard of the media watchdog group Reporters Without Borders.

“In its current form, this Orwellian law establishes nothing less than a ‘ministry of truth’ that would be free to silence independent voices and impose the ruling party’s line.”

According to human rights watchdog Freedom House, at least 17 countries approved or proposed laws to restrict online media in the name of fighting “fake news” and manipulation, and 13 countries prosecuted internet users for spreading “false” information.

[Read full story here...](#)



Google Keeps ‘News Blacklist’ To Manually Skew Search Results

After boldly denying before Congress that they don’t manually manipulate search results, Google has been busted again for lying. In fact, they DO manually skew search results when it suits their leftist views and they were caught red-handed. □ TN Editor

Google does manipulate its search results manually, contrary to the company's official denials, documents obtained exclusively by The Daily Caller indicate.

Two official policies dubbed the "misrepresentation policy" and the "good neighbor policy" inform the company's "XPA news blacklist," which is maintained by Google's Trust & Safety team. "T&S will be in charge of updating the blacklist as when there is a demand," reads one of the documents shared with The Daily Caller.

"The deceptive_news domain blacklist is going to be used by many search features to filter problematic sites that violate the good neighbor and misrepresentation policies," the policy document says. [**RELATED: Meet The Five Google Staffers Who Circulated The Petition To Drop Kay Coles James**](#)

That document reads that it was, "approved by gomes@, nayak@, haahr@ as of 8/13/2018." Ben Gomes is Google's head of search, who reports directly to CEO Sundar Pichai. Pandu Nayak is a Google Fellow, and Paul Haahr is a software engineer, whose bio on Google's internal network Moma indicates that he is also involved in, "fringe ranking: not showing fake news, hate speech, conspiracy theories, or science/medical/history denial unless we're sure that's what the user wants."

"The purpose of the blacklist will be to bar the sites from surfacing in any Search feature or news product. It will not cause a demotion in the organic search results or de-index them altogether," reads the policy document obtained by the Caller. What that means is that targeted sites will not be removed from the "ten blue links" portion of search results, but the blacklist applies to most of the other search features, like "top news," "videos" or the various sidebars that are returned as search results.

In a section of the memo entitled "Eligibility for GNP [Good Neighbor Policy] enforcement," the types of search results impacted by the policy are described:

"If your product shows any of the following, Misrep and GNP would

apply to your PA.

- Shows content from users and news publishers (percieved 3P voice). Ex: UGC, News corpus, etc.
- Outputs single answers (perceived to come from the open web). Ex: Web answers, Video answers, etc.
- Shows content owned, licensed, or edited by Google (perceived to come directly from Google). Ex: Knowledge panels, News summaries, Oneboxes, Munin carousels, etc.”

The “ten blue links” may not be impacted by the blacklist, but virtually every other kind of Google search result is. While hard numbers are not available for how much traffic is directed through the 10 links versus the other search blocks, since the latter appear so high on the results page, the impact could be significant.

[Read full story here...](#)



Update: Google Cancels AI Ethics Panel After Uproar

Google's ethics panel got swarmed by thousands of (unethical?) non-participants attacking individual members of its ethics panel. The result was utter chaos, resignations and finally, cancelling the whole thing. Big Tech and ethics are approaching oxymoronic status. □ TN Editor

This week, Vox and other outlets [reported](#) that Google's newly created AI ethics board was falling apart amid controversy over several of the board members.

Well, it's officially done falling apart — it's been canceled. Google told Vox on Thursday that it's pulling the plug on the ethics board.

The board survived for barely more than one week. Founded to guide "responsible development of AI" at Google, it would have had eight members and met four times over the course of 2019 to consider concerns about Google's AI program. Those concerns include how AI can enable authoritarian states, how AI algorithms produce disparate outcomes, whether to work on military applications of AI, and more. But it ran into problems from the start.

Thousands of Google employees signed a [petition calling for the removal](#) of one board member, Heritage Foundation president Kay Coles James, over her comments about trans people and her organization's skepticism of climate change. Meanwhile, the inclusion of drone company CEO Dyan Gibbens reopened old divisions in the company over the [use of the company's AI for military applications](#).

Board member Alessandro Acquisti [resigned](#). Another member, Joanna Bryson, defending her decision not to resign, [claimed of James](#), "Believe it or not, I know worse about one of the other people." Other board members found themselves [swamped](#) with demands that they justify their decision to remain on the board.

Thursday afternoon, a Google spokesperson told Vox that the company has decided to dissolve the panel, called the Advanced Technology

External Advisory Council (ATEAC), entirely. Here is the company's statement in full:

It's become clear that in the current environment, ATEAC can't function as we wanted. So we're ending the council and going back to the drawing board. We'll continue to be responsible in our work on the important issues that AI raises, and will find different ways of getting outside opinions on these topics.

The panel was supposed to add outside perspectives to ongoing AI ethics work by Google engineers, all of which will continue. Hopefully, the cancellation of the board doesn't represent a retreat from Google's AI ethics work, but a chance to consider how to more constructively engage outside stakeholders.

The board was turning into a huge liability for Google

The board's credibility first took a hit when Alessandro Acquisti, a privacy researcher, [announced on Twitter](#) that he was stepping down, arguing, "While I'm devoted to research grappling with key ethical issues of fairness, rights & inclusion in AI, I don't believe this is the right forum for me to engage in this important work."

Meanwhile, the [petition to remove Kay Coles James](#) has attracted more than 2,300 signatures from Google employees so far and showed no signs of losing steam.

As anger about the board intensified, board members were drawn into extended ethical debates about why they were on the board, which can't have been what Google was hoping for. On Facebook, board member Luciano Floridi, a philosopher of ethics at Oxford, mused:

Asking for [Kay Coles James's] advice was a grave error and sends the wrong message about the nature and goals of the whole ATEAC project. From an ethical perspective, Google has misjudged what it means to have representative views in a broader context. If Mrs. Coles James does not resign, as I hope she does, and if Google does

not remove her
(<https://medium.com/.../googlers-against-transphobia-and-hate-...>),
as I have personally recommended, the question becomes: what is
the right moral stance to take in view of this grave error?

He ended up deciding to stay on the panel, but that was not the kind of ethical debate Google had been hoping to spark — and it became hard to imagine the two working together.

That wasn't the only problem. I [argued a day ago](#) that, outrage aside, the board was not well set up for success. AI ethics boards like Google's, which are in vogue in Silicon Valley, largely appear not to be equipped to solve, or even make progress on, hard questions about ethical AI progress.

A role on Google's AI board was an unpaid, toothless position that cannot possibly, in four meetings over the course of a year, arrive at a clear understanding of everything Google is doing, let alone offer nuanced guidance on it. There are urgent ethical questions about the AI work Google is doing — and no real avenue by which the board could address them satisfactorily. From the start, it was badly designed for the goal.

Now it has been canceled.

[Read full story here...](#)



European Union's Nightmare Of Internet Copyright And Censorship

The EU just passed Article 13 that will change the Internet forever. it will prevent any sharing of original content without express permission from the copyright holder. This will end sharing/reposting news articles and pictures and it is forcing social media giants to install upload filters to automatically block offenders. □ TN Editor

Tuesday's move will update the EU's 20-year-old copyright rules and will govern audiovisual content, much to the dismay of many social media users who have already begun outpouring their grief online.

However the parliament said in a [statement](#) that sharing memes and gifs has been protected "even more than it was before" and they will continue to be available and shareable on online platforms.

MEPs passed the legislation by 348 votes to 274 Tuesday. Opponents had hoped for last-minute amendments to be made but their efforts were in vain.

Julia Reda, a German MEP with the Pirate Party, described it as a “*dark day for internet freedom.*”

Article 13 or ‘The Directive on Copyright in the Digital Single Market’ makes all platforms legally responsible for the content hosted and shared on their platforms.

The process of updating the bloc’s copyright laws began in the European Commission two years ago, ostensibly to protect Europe’s publishers, broadcasters and artists and guarantee fair compensation from big tech companies.

The onus will now be on tech companies to clamp down on content-sharing on their platforms, which will likely ensure yet more draconian policing of speech and content.

EU member states now have two years to pass their own laws putting Article 13 into effect.

Tens of thousands marched in protest across Germany ahead of the vote, decrying what they viewed as severe online censorship.

Tech giant Google said that while the directive is “*improved*” it will still lead to legal uncertainty and will damage Europe’s creative and digital economies.

[Read full story here...](#)



Big Tech's Censorship Continues To Squeeze Free Speech

Technocrats in Big Tech companies march to their own drumbeat of Technocracy, driving for a fully-engineered society controlled by them. Their self-view as masters of the universe will eventually be rejected . □
TN Editor

As Big Tech's censorship of conservatives becomes ever more flagrant and overt, the old arguments about protecting the sanctity of the modern public square are now invalid. Our right to freely engage in public discourse through speech is under sustained attack, necessitating a vigorous defense against the major social media and internet platforms.

From "shadowbans" on [Facebook](#) and [Twitter](#), to [demonetization of YouTube videos](#), to [pulled](#) ads for Republican candidates at the critical junctures of election campaigns, the list of [violations against the online](#)

[practices and speech of conservatives](#) is long.

I certainly had my suspicions confirmed when Instagram, which is owned by Facebook, “accidentally” [censored](#) a post I made regarding the Jussie Smollett hoax, which consequently led to me hearing from hundreds of my followers about how they’ve been having problems seeing, liking or being able to interact with my posts. Many of them even claimed that they’ve had to repeatedly refollow me, as Instagram keeps unfollowing me on their accounts.

While nothing about Big Tech’s censorship of conservatives truly surprises me anymore, it’s still chilling to see the proof for yourself. If it can happen to me, the son of the president, with millions of followers on social media, just think about how bad it must be for conservatives with smaller followings and those who don’t have the soapbox or media reach to push back when they’re being targeted?

Thanks to a brave Facebook whistleblower who [approached](#) James O’Keefe’s Project Veritas, we now know that [Mark Zuckerberg](#)’s social media giant developed algorithms to “deboost” certain content, limiting its distribution and appearance in news feeds. As you probably guessed, this stealth censorship was specifically aimed at conservatives.

Facebook appears to have deliberately [tailored](#) its algorithm to recognize the syntax and style popular among conservatives in order to “deboost” that content. “Mainstream media,” “SJW” (Social Justice Warrior) and “red pill” — all terms that conservatives often use to express themselves — were listed as red flags, according to the former Facebook insider.

Facebook engineers even cited BlazeTV host Lauren Chen’s video criticizing the social justice movement as an example of the kind of “red pills” that users just aren’t allowed to drop anymore. Mainstream conservative content was [strangled](#) in real time, yet fringe leftists such as the Young Turks enjoy free rein on the social media platform.

Despite the occasional [brave gesture](#), politicians have been far too sluggish in recognizing the extent of the problem. But the Republican Party and the conservative movement are becoming more vigilant

against the suppression of our speech, as we saw at last weekend's [Conservative Political Action Conference \(CPAC\)](#).

Silicon Valley lobbyists have splashed [millions of dollars](#) all over the Washington swamp to play on conservatives' innate faith in the free-market system and respect for private property. Even as Big Tech companies work to exclude us from the town square of the 21st century, they've been able to rely on misguided conservatives to [carry water](#) for them with irrelevant pedantry about whether the First Amendment [applies](#) in cases of social media censorship.

[Read full story here...](#)