

Think Tank Proves Mass Censorship of Internet Worldwide. The Role of Search Engines. What are the Solutions

Official Report Unveils New Legal Strategy to Enforce Free Speech as Human Rights Against Violating Corporations

By [Magna Carta Bar Chambers](#)

Global Research, August 21, 2017

Region: [USA](#)

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

*“The only legitimate role of search engines is to provide relevant search results, to facilitate public access to information. The only legitimate role of social media platforms is to facilitate public access to communications. ... Content carriers have no legal nor moral authority to be self-appointed censors, nor to be self-proclaimed arbiters of Fact or Truth.” - **Prince Judge Matthew of Thebes***

At the request of the international Judiciary, the Council on Alternative Policy Studies (CAPS), an inter-governmental university think tank, has issued a ground-breaking exposé report proving the shocking reality of full-scale mass censorship of the Internet worldwide, and giving practical solutions for individuals to gain open access to uncensored Internet resources.

The 30-page think-tank report, entitled “[How to Break Free From Internet Censorship Now](#)”, concludes that

“humanity is directly confronted with... mass censorship, which was already quietly rolled out in full force by globalist mega-corporations... That rollout was completed while the mainstream establishment media... distracted with superficial stories of artificially divisive politics, while suppressing any mention of the fact of censorship.”

As the report notes:

“Without this presentation proving censorship, most people would not believe it, precisely because that same censorship in collusion with mainstream media willfully prevents them from knowing about this massive event.”

The report calls “for the general public... abandoning the online platforms of self-appointed censors, and switching to free and fair service providers”, with this dire warning:

“If humanity does not collectively send the strongest possible message to censoring mega-corporations now, then it will quickly and perhaps permanently lose all human rights to individually communicate any meaningful

messages to each other.”

The report declares:

“The only legitimate role of search engines is to provide relevant search results, to facilitate public access to information. The only legitimate role of social media platforms is to facilitate public access to communications. By restricting access by censorship to impose and enforce only state-sanctioned mainstream narratives, service providers abandon that essential function, thereby destroying the sole justification for their own existence.”

It further declares:

“Search engines and social media content carriers have no legal nor moral authority to be self-appointed censors, nor to be self-proclaimed arbiters of Fact or Truth. Moreover, they have no professional qualifications to usurp any such role. Throughout all of human history since the beginning of time, it has been the exclusive domain of the independent Judiciary profession, relying upon and closely backed by free and independent Academia of classical scholarship, to be the ‘finders of fact’.”

The think tank report emphasized the profound impact of this mass censorship as a “full-scale assault against all Academia, Science, Law and Justice, directly attacking the very pillars of civilization”:

“Now, with this new censorship... of the primary flow of information and communications worldwide, the professions which are the essential pillars of civilization can no longer rely on the establishment channels of access to information: Academics can no longer conduct scholarly research... with any confidence that they have access to all relevant facts... A whole generation of scholars is being sabotaged; Lawyers [and Judges] can no longer develop cases... with any confidence in finding all relevant verifiable facts... A whole generation of jurists is being sabotaged.”

Faithful to the sub-title of the report, “Solutions to Continue Independent Research of Factual Truth”, it reveals many hard-hitting practical tools to uphold free speech:

For anti-censorship search engine alternatives to replace Google, Bing and Yahoo, it recommends DuckDuckGo, Qwant, UnBubble, and GoodGopher; For anti-censorship video service alternatives to replace YouTube, it recommends Minds, Vidme, DailyMotion, and Vimeo, combined with Patreon for monetization; For anti-censorship social media platform alternatives to replace Facebook and Twitter, it recommends Minds, Seen, Gab, and Diaspora. It also recommends a list of uncensored reliable and credible news outlets which give fair coverage to independent or alternative news reports.

The inter-governmental Council on Alternative Policy Studies (CAPS) proved that

“the propaganda narrative of mainstream ‘news’ media, that” censorship “is only prohibited... if done by an official government agency, or by a near-

monopoly as a quasi-public utility, is false... it completely ignores the very existence of human rights... at the higher level of international law.”

The think tank developed the following new legal strategy for enforcing international law on free speech as human rights, even in domestic Courts, and even against private corporations:

(A) All countries of the world have recognized the right to freedom of speech, and the right to freedom of “correspondence” as communications, both enforceable by the right to equal protection of law, as fundamental human rights, protected by the UN Declaration of Human Rights (Articles 19, 12, 7) and UN Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (Articles 19.2, 17, 26);

(B) International law imposes direct corporate and even personal liability for violations of human rights, subject to direct corporate and individual sanctions and penalties, under the UN Responsibility to Protect Human Rights (Articles 10-11), UN Remedy for Violations of Human Rights (Article 3(b)), and UN Justice for Victims of Abuse of Power (Article 8).

(C) All countries are required to enforce international human rights law both in domestic law enforcement and domestic Courts, under the UN Right to Protect Human Rights (Articles 9.5, 10-11). The United States Constitution confirms that “all treaties” - including UN human rights conventions - are “the supreme law of the land” and thus must be enforced by all American Courts (Article 6).

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Magna Carta Bar Chambers](#), Global Research, 2017

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: **[Magna Carta Bar Chambers](#)**

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