



Facebook Shows Anti-Christian Bias By Denying Gospel Music Video As ‘Political Content’

The fact that Facebook apologized for being caught with two high-profile censorship ‘oversights’, is meaningless. The real question is, how many thousands or tens of thousands of videos and posts have been removed without resistance or public outcry? The public will be pacified by Facebook’s contrition even as it ratchets up its AI censorship program. □
TN Editor

Facebook’s recent crackdown on advertising it considers political has already affected news publishers and small businesses like hair salons and day-care centers.

Now a gospel music group can be added to the list.

Last month, Zion’s Joy!, a vocal ensemble from Indianapolis, posted a video to its Facebook page for a new song, “What Would Heaven Look Like.” The video opens with images of strife and protests — including scenes of demonstrators in Charlottesville, Virginia — as the group sings lines including, “I know it might feel like this trouble will stay, but this

world will soon fade away.”

“We want to touch people’s hearts and let people know that we can do better than the world is doing right now,” Robert W. Stevenson, the group’s founder, said in an interview.

After a week, Zion’s Joy! decided to promote the video by paying Facebook for a “boost.” That’s when the social media giant’s algorithm flagged “What Would Heaven Look Like” as “political content” and blocked the video altogether, Stevenson said.

In a statement, a Facebook spokeswoman said Thursday that its political ad policy is “new, broad and exists to prevent election interference, so we’re asking people with content that falls under those rules to simply get authorized and show who paid for the ad in order for it to run.”

“Separately,” the statement continued, “we made an error by deleting the original post. As soon as we identified what happened, we restored the post since it does not violate our Community Standards and have apologized to Zion’s Joy.”

The removal of the video is only the latest example of how Facebook’s rules for identifying political content — tightened in the wake of political pressure over the company’s role in the 2016 presidential election — have labeled various forms of content as political, stirring objections from users and publishers.

The New York Times has complained that its paid promotions for its reporting on politics — and even for posts on subjects as innocuous as a cake recipe — have been treated as political advertising by Facebook. More recently, Facebook notified a publisher in Texas that it had violated the social network’s standards on hate speech by posting an excerpt from the Declaration of Independence. (In the company’s defense, the excerpt included the term “Indian Savages,” and Facebook told Gizmodo it had removed the post “by mistake and restored it as soon as we looked into it.”)

Under Facebook’s new rules, all “election-related and issue ads” — including posts that are promoted through paid boosts — must contain a

disclosure about who paid for them, and the ads will be collected into a searchable archive.

The first 30 seconds of the four-minute video for “What Would Heaven Look Like” include scenes of protesters crying, waving the American flag and being carried away in stretchers. There is also a brief image of a demonstrator, standing in front of a building bearing a Trump logo, who is holding a sign critical of the Dakota Access Pipeline.

The rest of the video, for the most part, shows the group’s singers lip-syncing in a recording studio and on a rooftop.

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



Without Strong Resistance, A

U.S. Police State Is A Certainty

A police state is emerging in the United States and its implementation is speeding up as it moves further ahead. That is, the rate of increase is compounded (not linear), assuring that the curve will turn vertical in 5-8 years. Unless Americans stop this nonsense soon, we will lose all control over our lives. □ TN Editor

x

For many years, I've forecasted that the US will evolve into a police state; that it will begin slowly; then as more and more freedoms are removed, the creation of the police state will accelerate.

We're now seeing that acceleration, as more and more Americans are detained, questioned, and having their property confiscated than ever before.

As an example, in 2016, some 20,000 travellers in and out of the US were stopped, often at random. Typically, their baggage was searched, their documents photocopied, access codes to their electronic devices demanded and their files copied. In most cases, no explanation was given, but they were advised that if the search was refused, they would be detained indefinitely.

The following year, in 2017, the numbers of people detained *rose by 50%*, to 30,000.

It's important to note that the travellers were not threatened with arrest, which suggests that the authorities were working on the basis that the Patriot Act of 2001 allows all of the above activities—without cause being given, without a warrant being obtained, without access to a phone call or legal representation being allowed, and that the individuals in question may be detained, *indefinitely*.

This, of course, is in direct violation of the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution, which states that people have the right "to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures."

However, when people travel, they are particularly vulnerable, so the travellers in question are extremely unlikely to refuse. They understand that, “indefinitely” means, “until a Supreme Court ruling is passed, overturning the Patriot Act as unconstitutional.” If it hasn’t happened yet and isn’t under consideration, it’s safe to say that the level of police state allowed under the Patriot Act is permanent.

Police States have been implemented countless times throughout history. They tend to be most prominent where collectivism has already been instituted.

Wherever collectivism is already firmly established, new crackdowns are generally introduced suddenly. In Germany, in 1938, under existing Nazi rule, Kristallnacht took people by complete surprise. Later, in 1961, under existing Soviet rule, the Berlin Wall went up with no previous announcement. In both cases, the collectivist tyranny was already in place and the people had already successfully been subjugated. These events were merely further losses of freedom.

But what of a country that still enjoys a few of its former freedoms and is in the *process* of being transformed into a full-blown collectivist state? Well, in such cases, the loss of freedoms is often done in slo-mo.

Another way of describing this is the old adage of boiling a frog. Since a frog will jump out of a pot of hot water, place him in a pot of lukewarm water and slowly turn up the heat. Before he knows it, he’s being boiled to death.

Likewise, when the intention is to convert a country to collectivism, make the early changes in stages. Get the people to accept that the losses of freedom are for the benefit of their safety. Then, *the further along you go, the more you can accelerate the process.*

At present, a majority of Americans appear to now understand that they’ve experienced a significant loss of their “guaranteed” freedoms. They’re now worried and, at each new stage of oppression they tend to say, “I’m not happy about this, but I can probably live with it... and, besides, they say that they’re doing it for my own safety.”

However, I think that it's safe to say that a family returning from a holiday that's just been isolated from each other, interrogated separately, frisked, had all their belongings pored through and copies of their papers and electronic files taken, *without even being told the reason*, does not feel as though it's been done for their safety.

Remember, the 30,000 above were just hoping to reach their destination with no trouble from anyone. A generation ago, they never would have tolerated such a violation to their rights. But now, they submit and accept whatever they're told to do.

But, upon release, they most likely assumed that the authorities had been looking for something specific. *They were not*. In recent years, there have been very few actual prosecutions from such Gestapo-like shakedowns, in spite of the copying of documents and confiscation of minor items. The object here is not to prosecute anyone; it is to *teach people to submit*.

This will be important later on.

What we're witnessing is a loss of freedom in slo-mo. Just as Germans stood by and accepted Kristallnacht; just as they stood by and watched the Berlin Wall be built that would close off their freedom of migration, the great majority of Americans ultimately will stand by and watch the last of their freedoms be removed, because they've already been trained to submit to *whatever* indignities and restrictions are placed upon them.

After World War II, Lutheran Pastor Martin Niemöller was questioned as to how he and other Germans could possibly have simply stood by and watched as freedoms were removed, resulting eventually in total domination of the German people. He said,

First they came for the Socialists, and I did not speak out because I was not a Socialist.

Then they came for the Trade Unionists, and I did not speak out because I was not a Trade Unionist.

Then they came for the Jews, and I did not speak out because I was

not a Jew.

Then they came for me—and there was no one left to speak for me.

Pastor Niemöller was able to make the above statement in 1976, as he was one of the few survivors of the concentration camps.

But, in addition to the above insight, there's another very significant lesson to be learned here. Historically, whenever a government is instituting the transition into a collectivist state, one of the early warnings is a limitation on travel outside the country (getting the people used to the idea that they don't have a *right* to leave). The US has now reached that point. The next development will be to teach them that, by travelling outside of the country, they are *automatically* suspect. The implication will be money laundering, drug trafficking, or terrorist activities.

Whether it's accomplished through the use of a physical barrier, such as a wall, or through the intimidation of random searches and interrogations, as is presently underway in the US, or whether it's simply the appearance of armed guards in ports of exit (like the armed guard in the photo above), the objective is not to obtain copies of your emails to your friends, or to go through socks in your luggage. It's to teach you that your rights have been lost and you are *expected* to submit to any and all indignities and restrictions imposed on you.

Historically, the end-product is always the same. The final acceptance that you've waited too long to leave the increasingly oppressive country—and that you've been successfully locked in.

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



UKIP 'Saves The Internet' By Forcing EU To Back Down On Copyright Laws

EU Technocrats almost destroyed the Internet and Free Speech by imposing a 'link tax' requiring payment for any linked content - like what you are reading here on Technocracy.News. It would have all but destroyed the alternative media industry. The initial negotiations were carried out in secret. □ TN Editor

The European Parliament has voted to delay new copyright laws that would have required the monitoring of all online uploads and could have effectively outlawed meme culture.

The [proposed laws](#) come amid a sustained [effort](#) by the European Union (EU) to regulate expression online and were met with a '[Save Your Internet](#)' campaign which united activists across the political divide.

The EU attempted to rush the laws through and into secret negotiations with the European Council and unelected European Commission before UKIP and other parties pushed for a vote.

Earlier this week, UKIP leader Gerard Batten [blasted](#) the proposed laws,

known as Article 13 and the 'link tax' Article 11, as an attempt to "destroy the capacity for free speech" online.

A total of 318 MEPs [voted against](#) opening the secret talks this Wednesday, with 278 voting favour and 31 abstaining.

The result delays the final decision and gives the European Parliament more time to deliberate and amend the proposals before a decision is taken in September.

Mr Batten said Thursday that he wanted the final text to protect "alternative media" after critics claimed the 'link tax', whereby websites would be charged for referencing content, would hand the well-resourced mainstream media an advantage.

A series of high profile figures had joined the campaign against the proposals, including comedian Stephen Fry, British inventor of the World Wide Web Sir [Tim Berners-Lee](#), and co-founder of Wikipedia Jimmy Wales.

In favour of the proposals were some wealthy musicians, including former Beatle Sir Paul McCartney, as well as many large publishing groups.

"We have a 1st win!" the 'Save the Internet' campaign [said](#) in a statement. "On 5 July, the European Parliament plenary voted against the mandate to start negotiations with [the] Council.

"However, the battle to defeat the Article 13 Censorship Machine is far from over: it must now be won in the European Parliament plenary in September."

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