



# Selective Censorship: Apple Pulls Pro-Life Group's App From App Store

Selective censorship by media giants is increasing at an alarming speed: if they don't like your politics or morality, they simply push the 'eject' button and you disappear. Technocrats have no ethical boundaries in censorship because they believe so strongly that they are right and everyone else is wrong. □ TN Editor

After the social media giant [Twitter came under fire for censoring a pro-life ad](#), another huge media icon is facing criticism.

This time, a pro-life group tells LifeNews that Apple approved and subsequently removed its app from the App Store after criticism from abortion activists and liberal media outlets. As Human Coalition informs LifeNews, it released a mobile app allowing pro-life individuals and church groups to pray for Human Coalition's abortion-seeking clients,

who remain anonymous, in real time. The app, “Human Coalition,” was available for android devices in the Google Play Store, and in the Apple App Store for iOS.

After that, this past summer, the pro-life group came under intense public criticism as pro-abortion journalists took notice of the app and began attacking Human Coalition for urging pro-life people to pray for women contemplating abortion. Some articles falsely accused Human Coalition of making public women’s private information.

Left-wing writer Christina Cauterucci at the pro-abortion blog Slate [wrote](#):

*With the help of an app developed by the anti-abortion Human Coalition, it was easy! I saved real-live babies from the clutches of money-grubbing abortion providers with just a couple dozen swipes of my right thumb, as if I were paging through Tinder or wiping a little schmutz off the screen of my phone.*

*You too can be a baby-saving hero. Your superpower awaits at your favored app store, searchable under “Human Coalition.”*

And Amelia Tait at the U.K.’s The New Statesman [wrote](#):

*Are digital anti-abortion prayers sanctioned by the church? Do they reach God? Though these questions may seem faintly ridiculous, their answers seem more important than ever. When it comes to the tech behind these anti-abortion apps however, that is where people – religious or not – might do well to lose a little faith.*

That’s when Human Coalition tells LifeNews the problems began.

“In July, on the heels of pro-abortion media pushback, Apple notified us that they had removed the Human Coalition app from the App Store, citing violations of certain functionality requirements. However, Human Coalition spoke with Apple and demonstrated that not only were the cited requirements met, but that the Human Coalition app exceeded minimum requirements and functioned better than similar apps from other developers,” it said.

It added: “Apple was unable or unwilling to identify a specific improvement that, if completed, would merit the Human Coalition app’s reinstatement in the App Store. Instead, the effect of Apple’s requirements for modifying the app before it could be re-submitted for consideration would be that Human Coalition would have to completely overhaul of the app — a cost-prohibitive and unnecessary demand.”


“Just weeks after Apple removed our pro-life app from the App Store, abortion activists announced a targeted campaign aimed at stopping our pro-life work in the city of Atlanta. The Netroots Nations conference, with sponsorship from the abortion industry and major corporate backers [including Google and Facebook](#), included in its agenda [a protest of Human Coalition’s Atlanta clinic](#), the group continued.

The pro-life organization says this is another in the latest trend of media outlets and abortion advocates pushing to silence pro-life views.

“Censorship of pro-life voices is a growing trend in the United States. Pro-abortion media, for their part, have demonstrated time and again their willingness to reinforce bogus and false narratives about pro-life Americans, going so far as to try to [bully pro-life voices into silence](#). Human Coalition will continue rescuing children from abortion and serving women and families until abortion is unthinkable and unavailable in our nation,” it concluded.

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

---



# The Incredible Legacy Of Antony Sutton: Persecuted But Never Prosecuted

Antony Sutton uncovered and exposed the globalist cabal and subsequently got kicked out of UCLA and Stanford as his books were blacklisted. I am proud to have co-authored [Trilaterals Over Washington, Volumes I and II](#) with Sutton, which was *also* blacklisted and suppressed. Your support to raise awareness of Technocracy News and Trends, which continues in his memory, is critical to the future of liberty and freedom! □ Patrick Wood

The prodigious author and researcher, Antony Sutton (1925-2002), wrote about hidden men behind momentous events.

I recently came across [a 1999 interview with Sutton](#), conducted by Kris Millegan, researcher and head of [TrineDay publishers](#).

Millegan wrote about Antony Sutton in 1999: “Antony C. Sutton, 74, has been persecuted but never prosecuted for his research and subsequent publishing of his findings. His mainstream career was shattered by his devotion towards uncovering the truth. In 1968, his [Western Technology](#)

[and Soviet Economic Development](#) was published by The Hoover Institute at Stanford University (see also my additional piece [here](#)). Sutton showed how the Soviet state's technological and manufacturing base, which was then engaged in supplying the North Vietnamese the armaments and supplies to kill and wound American soldiers, was built by US firms and mostly paid for by the US taxpayers. From their largest steel and iron plant, to automobile manufacturing equipment, to precision ball-bearings and computers, basically the majority of the Soviet's large industrial enterprises had been built with the United States help or technical assistance."

"...Then, someone sent Antony a membership list of Skull and Bones and— 'a picture jumped out'. And what a picture! A multigenerational foreign-based secret society with fingers in all kinds of pies and roots going back to 'Illuminati' influences in 1830's Germany."

Here are excerpts from the 1999 interview:

Millegan - Can you tell the story of how you learned of Skull & Bones? And how you felt?

Sutton - I knew nothing of S&B until I received a letter in the early 80's asking if I would like to look at a genuine membership list. For no real reason I said yes. It was agreed to send the package by Federal Express and I could keep it for 24 hours, it had to be returned to the safe. It was a "black bag" job by a family member disgusted with their activities.

[the\_ad id="11018"]

For the benefit of any S&B members who may read and doubt the statement; the membership list is in two volumes, black leather bound. Living members and deceased members in separate volumes. Very handsome books.

I spent all night in Kinko's, Santa Cruz, copied the entire volumes and returned within the 24 hour period.

I have never released any copies or identified the source. I figured each copy could be coded and enable S&B to trace the leak.

How did I feel? I felt then (as I do now) that these “prominent” men are really immature juveniles at heart. The horrible reality is that these little boys have been dominant in their influence in world affairs. No wonder we have wars and violence. Skull and Bones is the symbol of terrorist violence, pirates, the SS Deaths Head Division in WW Two, labels on poison bottles and so on.

I kept the stack of xerox sheets for quite a while before I looked at them—when I did look—a picture jumped out, THIS was a significant part of the so called establishment. No wonder the world has problems!

Millegan: - What did your study of elites, economics, secrecy and technology do for your career?

Sutton - Depends what you mean by “career”?

By conventional standards I am an abject failure. I’ve been thrown out of two major Universities (UCLA and Stanford), denied tenure at Cal State Los Angeles. Every time I write something, it appears to offend someone in the Establishment and they throw me to the wolves.

On the other hand I’ve written 26 books, published a couple of newsletters and so on...even more important I’ve never compromised on the truth. And I don’t quit.

In material terms...hopeless failure. In terms of discovery...I think I’ve been successful. Judge a man by his enemies. William Buckley called me a “jerk”. Glenn Campbell, former Director of the Hoover Institution, Stanford called me “a problem”.

Millegan - Did any of Hitler’s economic policies threaten the interests of the international bankers, and if so did that play a role in his downfall?

Sutton - Hitler’s economic policies were OK’d by the bankers right through the war...ITT, Chase, Texaco and others were operating in Nazi-held France as late as 1945. In fact Chase in Paris was trying to get [acquire] Nazi accounts as late as 1944. When we got to Germany in May 1945, I remember seeing a (bombed-out) Woolworth store in Hamburg and thinking, “What’s Woolworth doing in Nazi Germany?” While we

were bombed and shelled it was “business as usual” for Big Business. Try the [Alien Custodian Papers](#).

...[Union Banking \[Corporation\]](#) is very important. I made a documentary for Dutch National TV some years ago. It got all the way through the production process to the Dutch TV Guide...at the last minute it was pulled and another film substituted. This documentary has proof of Bush financing Hitler—documents.

Maybe my Dutch friends will still get it viewed, but the apparatus reaches into Holland.

Millegan - What is the story that was going to be told on Dutch TV? And what is the story of its censorship?

Sutton - Couple of years back, a Dutch TV production company from Amsterdam—under contract to Dutch National TV—came to US to make documentary on S&B [Skull and Bones]. They went to the Bones Temple and other places and interviewed people on East Coast. On West Coast, they interviewed myself and one other person.

I saw extracts from the original and it is a good professional job. They had documents linking Bush family and other S&B members to financing Hitler through Union Banking of New York and its Dutch correspondent bank. More than I have in [Sutton’s book] [WALL STREET AND THE RISE OF HITLER](#).

The first version was later upgraded into a two part documentary and scheduled for showing this last March. It was pulled at last minute and has never been shown.

*(This Dutch TV production is on YouTube in two parts: [Part 1](#) and [Part 2](#))*

Millegan - What do you see for the future?

Sutton - Chaos, confusion and ultimately a battle between the individual and the State.

The individual is the stronger; and will win. The state is a fiction sanctified by Hegel and his followers to CONTROL the individual.

Sooner or later people will wake up. First we have to dump the trap of right and left, this is a Hegelian trap to divide and control. The battle is not between right and left; it is between us and them...

—end of interview excerpt—

Here is a telling Antony Sutton quote from his book, [\*The Best Enemy Money Can Buy\*](#)(1986):

“By using data of Russian origin it is possible to make an accurate analysis of the origins of this equipment. It was found that all the main diesel and steam-turbine propulsion systems of the ninety-six Soviet ships on the Haiphong supply run [to the North Vietnamese] that could be identified (i.e., eighty-four out of the ninety-six) originated in design or construction outside the USSR. We can conclude, therefore, that if the [US] State and Commerce Departments, in the 1950s and 1960s, had consistently enforced the legislation passed by Congress in 1949, the Soviets would not have had the ability to supply the Vietnamese War - and 50,000 more Americans and countless Vietnamese would be alive today.”

“Who were the government officials responsible for this transfer of known military technology? The concept originally came from National Security Adviser Henry Kissinger, who reportedly sold President Nixon on the idea that giving military technology to the Soviets would temper their global territorial ambitions. How Henry arrived at this gigantic non sequitur is not known. Sufficient to state that he aroused considerable concern over his motivations. Not least that Henry had been a paid family employee of the Rockefellers since 1958 and has served as International Advisory Committee Chairman of the Chase Manhattan Bank, a Rockefeller concern.”

If you think such traitorous actions could never have occurred, I point you to another researcher, Charles Higham, and his 1983 classic, [\*Trading with the Enemy\*](#).

Higham focuses on World War 2. The men behind the curtain Higham exposed are in the same basic group that Antony Sutton exposed.



Higham, Trading with the Enemy:

“What would have happened if millions of American and British people, struggling with coupons and lines at the gas stations, had learned that in 1942 Standard Oil of New Jersey [part of the Rockefeller empire] managers shipped the enemy’s [Germany’s] fuel through neutral Switzerland and that the enemy was shipping Allied fuel? Suppose the public had discovered that the Chase Bank in Nazi-occupied Paris after Pearl Harbor was doing millions of dollars’ worth of business with the enemy with the full knowledge of the head office in Manhattan [the Rockefeller family among others?] Or that Ford trucks were being built for the German occupation troops in France with authorization from Dearborn, Michigan? Or that Colonel Sosthenes Behn, the head of the international American telephone conglomerate ITT, flew from New York to Madrid to Berne during the war to help improve Hitler’s communications systems and improve the robot bombs that devastated London? Or that ITT built the FockeWulfs that dropped bombs on British and American troops? Or that crucial ball bearings were shipped to Nazi-associated customers in Latin America with the collusion of the vice-chairman of the U.S. War Production Board in partnership with Goering’s cousin in Philadelphia when American forces were desperately short of them? Or that such arrangements were known about in Washington and either sanctioned or deliberately ignored?”

Getting the picture?

War, what is it good for? It’s good for business. It’s good for creating chaos and destruction. It’s good for launching new global organizations, in the aftermath; organizations that exert a level of control and reach that didn’t exist before. It’s good for launching organizations like the United Nations and the European Union and the World Trade Organization—dedicated to Globalism, which in turn is dedicated to planned civilization, in which the individual is demeaned and the group is All.

Freedom is demeaned, and dominance by the few over the many is hailed as peace in our time.



## **Google To Conservative Website: Remove ‘Hateful’ Article Or Lose Ad Revenue**

Google is not just censoring content; apparently, it is now compiling a list of individuals who it will censor wherever they post, and on whichever website. Thus, websites will be punished for running stories by those banned writers. Google has gone completely rogue, having completely flip-flopped on its original motto, “Don’t be evil.” They are revealing the heart and soul of Technocracy - are you alarmed? □ TN Editor

On Tuesday evening, Google sent a conservative website an ultimatum: remove one of your articles, or lose the ability to make ad revenue on your website. The website was strong-armed into removing the content, and then warned that the page was “just an example and that the same violations may exist on other pages of this website.”

“Yesterday morning, we received a very bizarre letter from Google

issuing us an ultimatum,” Shane Trejo, media relations director of the Republican Liberty Caucus of Michigan, [wrote on The Liberty Conservative](#). “Either we were to remove a particular article or see all of our ad revenues choked off in an instant. This is the newest method that Big Brother is using to enforce thought control.”

The ultimatum came in the form of an email from Google’s ad placement service AdSense. The email specifically listed an article on The Liberty Conservative’s site, stating that the article violated AdSense’s policies.

“As stated in our program policies, Google ads may not be placed on pages that contain content that: Threatens or advocates harm on oneself or others; Harasses, intimidates or bullies an individual or group of individuals; Incites hatred against, promotes discrimination of, or disparages an individual or group on the basis of their race or ethnic origin, religion, disability, age, nationality, veteran status, sexual orientation, gender, gender identity, or other characteristic that is associated with systemic discrimination or marginalization,” the email stated.

The email warned The Liberty Conservative that it must either remove ads from that page, or “modify or remove the violating content to meet our AdSense policies.”

“Please be aware that if additional violations are accrued, ad serving may be disabled to the website listed above,” the AdSense email warned. “Please be aware that the URL above is just an example and that the same violations may exist on other pages of this website or other sites that you own.”

Trejo argued that the article Google specified “contained no offensive content.” Rather, it “was merely distinguishing the many differences between the alt-right and literal Nazis.”

The Liberty Conservative writer suggested that the article was singled out because it was written by *former* Liberty Conservative contributor James Allsup. Allsup was involved in the “Unite the Right” riot (which Trejo described as a “rally-turned-riot”) in Charlottesville, Va. Trejo said the article was targeted because “it was authored by a man deemed to

be an ‘unperson’ by the corporate elite.”

“Due to financial constraints, we had to comply with Google’s strong-arming tactics for the time being,” Trejo admitted. “An independent publisher such as The Liberty Conservative needs revenue from the Google ad platform in order to survive.”

Despite this necessary surrender, The Liberty Conservative writer remained optimistic. “We look forward to the day where rival ad platforms who respect the intellectual freedom of their customers can outcompete Google, but those days have not arrived yet,” he wrote. “These tech companies have us all by the short hairs, and post-Charlottesville, they are all working in unison to enforce the Orwellian nightmare. Nobody is safe.”

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



# The Long Arm Of Google: Trilateral Commission Censors Ousts Scholar From Think Tank

Two prominent Trilateral Commission members, **Eric Schmidt** of Google and **Anne-Marie Slaughter** of *New America Foundation*, colluded to fire Barry Lynn who had been critical of Google while employed by Slaughter's leftist organization. The Trilateral Commission was the lead organization who originally sponsored Technocracy beginning in 1973. (Read the full documentation in my book, [Technocracy Rising: The Trojan Horse of Global Transformation](#).) When Barry Lynn praised the EU's huge fine against Google (which it richly deserved), Schmidt wasted no time in contacting his Trilateral Commission crony to get Lynn fired. In similar fashion, Professor Antony Sutton was fired from the Hoover Institution for War, Peace and Revolution at Stanford University in 1975; Trilateral **David Packard** was then president of Stanford. *Trilaterals Over Washington*, co-authored by myself and Sutton, was banned from the nationwide B. Dalton Bookseller chain; Dalton's parent company had a Trilateral member on their board of directors.

This is how it works: Technocrats will not tolerate any serious critique of any kind. However, Left-wing or right-wing conspiracy theorists are *never* attacked because they serve to discredit serious scholarship. □ TN Editor

In the hours after European antitrust regulators levied a record [\\$2.7 billion fine](#) against Google in late June, an influential Washington think tank learned what can happen when a tech giant that shapes public policy debates with its enormous wealth is criticized.

The New America Foundation has received more than \$21 million from Google; its parent company's executive chairman, Eric Schmidt; and his family's foundation since the think tank's founding in 1999. That money helped to establish New America as an elite voice in policy debates on

the American left.

But not long after one of New America's scholars [posted a statement](#) on the think tank's website praising the European Union's penalty against Google, Mr. Schmidt, who had chaired New America until 2016, communicated his displeasure with the statement to the group's president, Anne-Marie Slaughter, according to the scholar.

[the\_ad id="11018"]

The statement disappeared from New America's website, only to be reposted without explanation a few hours later. But word of Mr. Schmidt's displeasure rippled through New America, which employs more than 200 people, including dozens of researchers, writers and scholars, most of whom work in sleek Washington offices where the main conference room is called the "Eric Schmidt Ideas Lab." The episode left some people concerned that Google intended to discontinue funding, while others worried whether the think tank could truly be independent if it had to worry about offending its donors.

Those worries seemed to be substantiated a couple of days later, when Ms. Slaughter summoned the scholar who wrote the critical statement, Barry Lynn, to her office. He ran a New America initiative called Open Markets that has led a [growing chorus of liberal criticism](#) of the market dominance of telecom and tech giants, including Google, which is now part of a larger corporate entity known as [Alphabet](#), for which Mr. Schmidt serves as executive chairman.

Ms. Slaughter told Mr. Lynn that "the time has come for Open Markets and New America to part ways," according to an email from Ms. Slaughter to Mr. Lynn. The email suggested that the entire Open Markets team — nearly 10 full-time employees and unpaid fellows — would be exiled from New America.

While she asserted in the email, which was reviewed by The New York Times, that the decision was "in no way based on the content of your work," Ms. Slaughter accused Mr. Lynn of "imperiling the institution as a whole."

Mr. Lynn, in an interview, charged that Ms. Slaughter caved to pressure from Mr. Schmidt and Google, and, in so doing, set the desires of a donor over the think tank's intellectual integrity.

"Google is very aggressive in throwing its money around Washington and Brussels, and then pulling the strings," Mr. Lynn said. "People are so afraid of Google now."

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