

Section 230: Protecting Internet Speech, The Censors and Censorship

By [Renee Parsons](#)

Global Research, May 17, 2020

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Law and Justice](#), [Media Disinformation](#), [Police State & Civil Rights](#)

With a better world on the horizon, the old order is desperately asserting its last vestige of power. What the perpetrators of the coronavirus event were not counting on was that the pandemic would usher in a new era of accelerated awakening as millions continue to acknowledge that there is a new [Quantum world](#) emerging.

That new awareness was followed by the spontaneous exposure of Big Pharma, Big Science and Big Medicine as more corrupt than previously imagined. At the same time, the disturbing truth of vaccines lacking scientific merit surfaced as receptacles for [nano particles](#) that would alter human [DNA](#) as well as enforcing a worldwide [mandatory vaccination](#) and [digital ID](#) program – all of which are violations of Universal Law.

It stands to reason that TPTB are terrified of a united opposition of seven billion inhabitants which will never accept their rule, thereby necessitating a direct [assault](#) on free speech and the full acquiescence of a more docile citizenry.

[Censorship](#) protects the powerful from criticism just as it needs to keep truth hidden from public awareness. Censorship is an outright admission that TPTB's grasp is slipping. As its control continues to falter, more censorship will be applied confirming that their message is not resonating while their control over the population continues to erode. With the public less than hoodwinked, a second radio frequency [wave](#) is assured.

[Section 230](#)

The Electronic Frontier Foundation refers to [Section 230](#) as “the most important law protecting internet speech.”

The Communications Decency Act (aka Title V of the Telecommunications Act of 1996) states that “*No provider or user of an interactive computer service shall be treated as the publisher or speaker of any information provided by another information content provider*” ([47 U.S.C. § 230](#)).

The translation is that Section 230 was specifically adopted to protect a service provider against illegal content; so that it could not be held legally liable for whatever a user might say on line. Thus Section 230 provides “immunity from liability for providers and users of an interactive computer service” which publishes information provided by third-party users:

Congressional Findings are clear: Section 230 was added to protect innovation, free speech and provide a neutral internet platform:

“...offers a forum for true diversity of political discourse, unique opportunities for cultural development, and myriad avenues for intellectual activity.”

Section 230 does not include any ‘community guidelines’ exceptions to allow service providers to make arbitrary, partisan decisions to censor what might be capriciously defined as objectionable or offensive content. Further,

(2) Civil liability No provider or user of an [interactive computer service](#) shall be held liable on account of—

(A) any action voluntarily taken in good faith to restrict access to or availability of material that the provider or user considers to be obscene, lewd, lascivious, filthy, excessively violent, harassing, or otherwise objectionable, whether or not such material is constitutionally protected; or...”

Clearly, the intent of Section 230 was always to protect internet content and not as a vehicle to allow Big Tech to censor, ban or de-platform/demonetize any website, individual or information that does not conform to a service providers variable political agenda.

In 2019, [Sen. Josh Hawley](#) (R-Mo) introduced “[Ending Support for Internet Censorship Act](#)” (S 1914) which would remove Section 230’s automatic government-sponsored immunity as Big Tech would be required to ‘earn’ that immunity back by providing evidence to the FTC that their algorithms and content-removal practices are politically neutral. S 1914 would require a super-majority FTC vote for Big Tech to reapply for government-granted immunity as it must renew its immunity every two years. In addition, S 1914 only applies to tech companies with more than 30 million active monthly users in the US,, more than 300 million active monthly users worldwide, or who have more than \$500 million in global annual revenue

The Censors

Since 2016, Big Tech has [revved up](#) its immense power to increasingly control and suppress political internet content. Aw Big Tech consistently violates its agreement to adhere to Section 230, they continue to assume the benefits of its government-granted immunity. Convinced of its political muscle, the tech industry have counted on a derelict Congress as they continue to subvert the free speech of any website or individual who thinks ‘outside the box’ or offers an [alternative](#) political point of view.

Big Tech routinely threaten and issues ultimatums to creators and providers of content although, according to Section 230, they have no authority to do so . Likewise, under Section 230, Big Tech has no authority to ban, censor, de-monetize or de-platform any of its content creators. It is long past time for Big Tech to be declared public utilities. Since the tech companies are privately held corporations and not ‘state actors,’ the First Amendment is not applicable.

More specifically, since the coronavirus crisis, Big Tech has increased its ability to [censor all discussion](#), even by Doctors, scientists and medical professionals who dare question the prevailing wisdom about all aspects of the on-going health crisis. Increasingly, the only opinions allowed are the one dimensional views that support Big Pharma and its friends.

Censorship

In response to a lawsuit complaining that You Tube (YT) is censoring conservative speech, a June 25, 2019 YT [response](#) declared “..we apply our policies fairly and without political bias. All creators are held to the same standard.”

With two billion monthly users who watch one billion hours a day, YT would easily qualify for S1914’s elimination of immunity and its need to provide the algorithmic data to prove its lack of bias. YouTube is especially egregious in routinely stretching its authority in suppressing free speech under the guise of committing a ‘community guideline’ violation.

In her recent rejection of Dr. Erickson’s [video](#) which attracted millions of worldwide viewers, **Susan Wojcicki**, YT CEO articulated [narrow explanation](#) confirming that all dissent, any medical information that goes against or even questions the establishmentarian view is verboten.

“...but then we talked about removing information that is problematic. Of course anything that is medically unsubstantiated, so people will say, take vitamin c, take turmeric, those will cure you, Those are examples of things as a violation of our policy ...anything that goes against World Health Organization recommendations would be a violation of our policy and so remove is another important part of our policy..”

Wojcicki continued that

“...just recently there was a theory that 5G was causing coronavirus symptoms. Now no established health organization says that 5G is the source of the issue. We quickly deemed that a violation of our policy, and removed that content“

When MS. Wojcicki suggested a blind adherence to WHO, is she referring to their recommendation that masks are not effective or rather their later ‘recommendation’ in favor of mandatory masks - and was she referring to WHO’s stated opinion that CV was not transmissible or their later turn around that amended that information?

According to Ms. Wojcicki’s pronouncement, she has the right of sole discretion to decide what medical information should be publicly available even as her opinions are ‘medically unsubstantiated.’

At a time when free and informed discussion is more vital than ever, Ms. W’s lacks the understanding of the necessary role of inquiry and debate as fundamental to Science, she does a disservice to all YT patrons. As a discipline that thrives on continued exploration of fact-based evidence which was once the heart of Science, Ms W’s subjective preference is to see them through the narrow authoritarian lens as unnecessary and trivial. With regard to a possible 5G role in the CV, her lack of a curious mind about the [military uses](#) of the electro magnetic spectrum denies YT subscribers an opportunity to become better informed.

As the reality is obvious and we all recognize, this is not about the validity of Science or where the truth may lie; it is about the reality that dissent is no longer tolerated even by inferior minds; that those in positions of political power are intent on destroying the First Amendment and shutting down the public’s right to know. Try [BitChute](#).

*

Note to readers: please click the share buttons above or below. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

Renee Parsons has been a member of the ACLU's Florida State Board of Directors and President of the ACLU Treasure Coast Chapter. She has been an elected public official in Colorado, an environmental lobbyist with Friends of the Earth and staff member in the US House of Representatives in Washington, DC. Renee is a student of the Quantum Field. She may be reached at rdp@comcast.net. She is a frequent contributor to Global Research.

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Renee Parsons](#), Global Research, 2020

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Renee Parsons](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca