

Censorship is Free Speech?



by Miles Mathis

June 29, 2026

It's just Newspeak, isn't it? War is Peace. Freedom is Slavery. Ignorance is Strength. Censorship is Free Speech.

Doubleplusungood.

Nothing could be clearer evidence of how corrupt and Orwellian the world has become than [this argument at calawyers.org that censorship is protected free speech](#). The argument from these “attorneys” is that Google and other search engines are private companies acting as media enterprises, therefore the free speech and free press clauses of the Constitution can be read as protecting their right to be as biased in their listings as they like, since the Constitution has no guarantee of fairness and these entities “have not waived their right to selectively list however they like”.

No, they actually say that. They want you to believe that search results are “editorial judgment”, like you would see on an editorial page in a newspaper. They keep saying that a search engine is an “internet speaker”, to tie it to free speech, but a search engine is not an internet speaker. It is a search engine, which everyone knows is not a person or a speaker or a newspaper that has Constitutional rights to lie, distort, and censor.

As search engines, these entities are NOT acting like the press or media, they are acting as official government gatekeepers and arms of the federal government. Google has been a government front from the start, funded in the dark by various CIA and military backchannels, like everything else. Remember, Google came out of Mountain View, spawned by military via Shockley and Fairchild. But they have always wanted you to think these big companies were private, founded by college kids out of their basements, just so that they could later dodge these censorship charges. They then hire these

corrupt attorneys to come up with these oily arguments, where quashing freedom of speech is protected by the free speech clause of the Constitution. A topsy-turvy world.

They say,

The government may not tell the *Huffington Post* or the *Drudge Report* how to rank the news stories or opinion articles to which they link. Likewise, it may not do so for other speakers, such as search engines.

An obvious dodge, since a search engine is not a media outlet or speaker. It is a different entity altogether and everyone knows that. These attorneys want you to think the government cannot tell Google what to do, but who do you think is telling Google to censor people like me? The government! And not just Google of course. Facebook/Meta/Zuckerberg have now admitted the government was ordering it to censor wide swaths of information, which was always a given since Facebook is a government front, funded by DARPA and similar entities. The mainstream, including places like Wikipedia, now admit that. The same goes for Google, Twitter, Yahoo, Bing, Youtube, and I assume all other major outlets. X admitted it after Covid, remember? That is what the whole Musk brouhaha was about, where he allegedly fired all the government moles censoring the site. So we now *know* the government is ordering not just search engines but media outlets as well. Which means the “argument” of these fake attorneys just exploded in their faces. No matter what either side in some court case has argued, or what the courts have allegedly found, the government IS controlling both the search engines and the media, and has been doing it for decades or centuries. It is also controlling the courts, which just makes the joke bigger here. The only difference is that it has completely come out in the open in the past few years, everything going transparent. Which makes it all the more icky to see these attorneys saying this. They have clearly been ordered to try to justify this tyranny after the fact, by treating their audience as a bunch of retarded children, but that is just throwing gasoline on the fire. No one capable of reading the English language will read this and be fooled into thinking censorship is protected speech.

It would be like the tobacco companies trying to hide behind the free speech clause, claiming that when they said smoking didn't cause cancer, they were exercising their right to report certain experiments run by their corrupt in-house scientists and ignore all others; and besides they never waived their right report whatever they liked however they liked.

It would be like Pfizer or Fauci trying to hide behind the free speech clause, when they told you the vaccines were safe and effective, and that they prevented infection. According to this current argument, because Pfizer is a private company, it can say whatever it wants, since there is no Constitutional guarantee of truth or accuracy, and it has not waived its right to advertise in whatever way it see fit to do so.

But just any sane person knows there is a universal expectation that Pfizer and Fauci and Philip Morris not lie, there is a universal expectation that search engines will run unbiased searches, not that they tell you only what they want you to hear, hiding everything else. Which is why for many years they did. Or better than now, at any rate. That is because people do not think of search engines like they think of the *National Enquirer*. Because the ties to government are known, people do expect fairness, accuracy, oversight, and a strict avoidance of censorship.

That is why the first iteration of search engines was based on real numbers: visits, hits, keywords, and so on. And that is why the search engines are generally hiding the fact they have moved on to a second

iteration based on censorship, suppression, and propaganda. If this is all above board and Constitutional, then why are the search engines and the government and the oily lying attorneys hiding the switch? Why not lead all searches with the proud claim they have completely updated the method, boosting all government approved information and deleting the rest for your own good? We all know why: that would be admitting that 1984 is here. That would be admitting we now have a Chinese-style internet, or worse. Say it with me: CHI-NAH.

And why do they call that a Chinese-style internet? Because the internet in China has long been run by the state, jettisoning all non-approved content and opinion. The difference being that China has no Constitution, no free speech guarantees, and no pretense otherwise. People over there are aware everything they read and see is state propaganda. But here, where our rulers want the same thing, they had to do an end-run around the Constitution and the First Amendment, turning it on its head to protect the huge government fronts like Google doing the censorship. The Constitution was written to protect the powerless from the powerful, the little guy from the King and other big guys, but that has been flipped: it is now quoted by these weaselly lawyers to protect the government and huge corporations from truly private individuals like me. It is being used to protect liars from the truth. It is being used to protect scientists who can't do science from scientists who can do science. It is being used to protect artists who can't create art from those who can. It is being used to protect writers who can't write and poets who can't write against those who can. It is being used to protect debaters who can't debate (except by lying) from debaters who can debate.

Then they say,

The "point" of the rule that speakers may choose what to include and what to exclude "is simply the point of all speech protection, which is to shield just those choices of content that in someone's eyes are misguided, or even hurtful." *Hurley*, 515 U.S. at 574.

Yes, but that applies to the speech of individuals, not to search engines or huge companies working as government fronts. Government sponsored censorship is not just "hurtful speech", it is a thing in itself, an entirely separate category, so this "argument" is a logical fallacy. Censorship, by definition, *a priori* and *prima facie*, is NOT free speech. If what Google is doing were redefined as free speech, then censorship would be wiped from the dictionary and cease to exist. Censorship is the act of purposely silencing individuals or groups, and it is not protected as free speech by the Constitution or any other laws. Just the opposite, it is proscribed by the First Amendment, which expressly prohibits censorship. The Constitution is very compact, so you have to read intent, but the clear intent is to prohibit the government from quashing critics, either directly or through the media. It says Congress cannot pass laws to do this, but that clearly doesn't mean Congress or any other part of government may dodge this prohibition by working through faux-private companies to do it. There is absolutely no room for debate on that question, and anyone who argues that is just a paid liar.

And now for the punchline: at the bottom we find this:

Notes:

[1](#). This article grew out of a white paper commissioned by Google, but the views within it should not necessarily be ascribed to Google. This article appeared originally in the Fall 2013 issue of *Icarus*, the journal of the Media and Technology Committee of the ABA's Antitrust Section.

Again, you have to laugh. Google paid for it, but that doesn't mean Google paid for it. These hired

attorneys just accidentally argue Google is innocent of censorship. So lucky of Google to hire attorneys who agreed with it!

So have any real courts actually agreed with this finding, as these attorneys imply? What honest judge or jury could agree with it? The answer must be no, so if any court has agreed with it, that court must either be a fake CIA court, or the judge was bought off by the government. I don't see any third possibility there, so they can take their pick.

As a tack-on, a reader discovered another example of the down-and-dirty campaign the CIA has been running against me, in an Apple show called *Criminal Record*. In season two the main bad guy is a man who goes by Cosmo (real name Gavin Vosniak*) who is the head of some underground criminal enterprise. He produces an online conspiracy video channel (think YouTube) where he is claiming that certain racially-motivated murders in the news are fake. It shows him on his channel as a fast-talking, unhinged personality that analyzes photos and points out how they must be paste-ups because the lighting on the different faces in the group shot don't match (shadow/light). His "ridiculous conjecture" is pushing an "everything is fake" belief that is spreading. Then we learn that he has stolen 7 military-grade detonators and plans to launch a major terrorist bombing in London. Clearly he has sourced the other bomb components and an attack is imminent!

That's how CIA answers me, by creating this Anti, a person who does what I do, but who is a crazy terrorist. "A narcissist and a big mouth, with an online thing that nobody watches". Very subtle, guys. No one could figure out what you are doing there. They are hoping to blackwash the idea of photo analysis, but as usual they are just shooting themselves in the foot, giving my ideas a broader audience. It wouldn't be the first time new readers had shown up at my site after watching some propaganda at Netflix or Apple or HBO or BBC, after realizing the "bad guy" was onto something.

And if nobody reads me, as they are implying, strange, isn't it, that they have to expend so many resources, and not only in the States but also in the UK and Europe, trying to answer me. Hundreds of major movies, TV shows, youtube channels and websites devoted to trying to neutralize my influence. . . and failing.

Remember, MI6 hates me for blowing their [Orwell project](#), their [Turing project](#), and most of all their [Hawking project](#). That last one really hurt because he was allegedly still alive and the project was live. But when the *Daily Mail* agreed with me that he was an impostor, MI6 had to pull the plug on the project, with Hawking dying a couple of months later.

My reader added,

You know that back at HQ, down in the air-gapped bunker, there is an entire shrine dedicated to you. It's like your own Presidential Library.

Could be, because although we can sure many hate me, many others owe their jobs to me. They should be naming their children after me and dedicating new wings to me. Just think of the job creation at Langley alone in the past decade, as all these new agents are assigned to neutralizing me, slandering me, censoring me, and erasing comments at Youtube.

Just for a laugh, I watched a couple of episodes of this new propaganda, sponsored I suppose by MI5. What my reader missed is that there are two major characters named Doris Mathis and Errol Mathis. Season two opens with a clash between militant Muslims and local London boys armed with tire irons, with both sides being heavily blackwashed (though the local boys get the worst of the propaganda here, being labelled homegrown extremists). So just a continuation of the daily fake news cycles, where factionalism is being manufactured to keep your eyes off other things. Better a civil war than a revolution, you know, as far as the governors are concerned. They want you fighting each other instead of them. Of course the most innocent Muslim boy gets killed in the fake fight, to play on your emotions. The usual Mesmerism.

In the first ten minutes I had already seen multiple background markers, including room 11 where a prisoner was interrogated by the old lead guy, and some passing graffiti on the wall (min. 11:28) that had both the numbers 47 and 11. 47 being year one of the CIA, so their marker. Also strange that the lady police chief is wearing a black and white checkered tie, which is Masonic thrown in your face. I was able to confirm that is part of the uniform, but it is still strange now that I notice it. If you think it is just an accident, well, you would be wrong, since I researched it. It is called a Sillitoe check, named for Sir Percy Sillitoe, who was Chief Constable of Glasgow in the 1930s. His parents are hidden. But he was also later **Director of MI5** from 1946-53, and was knighted even before that, in 1936. So my MI5 guess is already confirmed.

The show is gray and depressing, with both leads being unattractive and without charisma. A very old white guy and a nearly bald black lady, both as grim as death. I suppose this is meant to be gritty or modern or something, but it just comes off as another downer, to introduce you to anti-depressants if you aren't already.

Suddenly, at minute 15, out of nowhere, our black lady lead searches on her phone for an old case where an 18-year-old boy killed his 16-year-old girlfriend. We then cut straight to her mother crying for the cameras outside the courtroom. Boo-hoo, another case faked by MI5 with hired actors. Does that tie in here, or did they just insert it in case you weren't already scrambling for the anti-depressants? We aren't sure, but they switch again, now to a scene of an antifa goon spray painting "vaccine genocide" on the wall, to blackwash anti-vaxxers. So they are hitting all the stops here. Brought to you by Pfizer.

Turns out our police lady thinks the boy killer may be out and that he is the one who killed the Muslim kid, based on one second of seeing red hair before he pulled down his balaclava. Neatly tying together all the fear porn here. One only wonders how they will manage to work in abortion, trannies, Nazis, and serial killers.

The good news is that this can't be popular in the US, since very few could follow the dialog. I have lived in Europe and am much better at decoding dialog in a foreign accent than most Americans, but this was hard even for me. It isn't the English of Roger Moore or even of Monty Python. It is not mid-Atlantic or Cambridge, it is realistic London dialog, heavy and fast and often mumbled. Few outside London or MI5 will be able to follow it, which is ironic. A realism that interferes with propaganda delivery is failed propaganda. Take note, agents.

By minute 30 we find the old guy is MI5, so there it is again, third time in this paper, which can't be a coincidence. This is MI5 writing about it itself, as usual. Doing what it does in real life, but this time selling the fiction as fiction instead of real, assuming you can no longer tell the difference. The TV fiction in support of the real-life fiction.

This series was supposedly written by its director Paul Rutman, but you should ask why he suddenly became so interested in MI5 and all its propaganda. He was previously known only for *Indian Summers* and eight episodes of *Vera*.

Bet you missed this. In the next scene, lady cop is out with her lady friend, drinking wine. Her friend has a “baby on board” pin, meaning she is pregnant. And drinking wine?

In the last scene, we find out the red-haired lad Billy knows the old MI5 agent Daniel, implying he is an asset. But why would this killer be an asset? Turn in next week for the thrilling conclusion, eh?

Nothing much happens in episode 2 until minute 14, when we find Daniel supposedly making a deal with Billy to work as an asset, admitting this to the black cop. This in order to get to Cosmo and ID the murderer of the Muslim boy at the same time. But we in the audience know Billy was already an asset, and that the lady cop is just being used as cover. Billy was already working for MI5, though we don't know how yet.

If you weren't already reaching for the Valium or Prozac, they now introduce another subplot, where the teenage son of the lady cop June calls her to say he is moving in with his father, leaving her alone. Also brought to you by Pfizer, I guess, though I don't actually know who makes those drugs. Looking it up, I am a bit out of date, no surprise, Pfizer's big one is Zoloft. Maybe we will see it on the counter in a later episode, next to Diet Coke, Bud Light, and a Big Mac.

Anyway, the old guy Daniel admits he has agreed to free Billy if he cooperates, and June now knows this. But we in the audience know that will never happen, since there is no way Billy survives this. And of course we aren't supposed to ask if Billy was an MI5 asset even during the “murder” of the girlfriend, since that was fake as well. Only my readers would think to go there.

Next we take a long walk through corridors to reach room . . . do you want to guess? What do we need to go with our previous room 11? The answer: room 8, giving us aces and eights. The place is being watched by both MI5 and the bad guys, which doesn't say much for MI5's covert abilities. Turns out they admit it: they forgot to turn off Billy's phone and were tracked through it. Brilliant, right? But what they don't admit is that you can still track a phone that is off, so they should have thrown it out the window, like Bruce Willis did in RED. Also brilliant is that they left their pretty young female MI5 agent alone out in the van with the phone. As you do. I guess the doors are unlocked and her gun is under the seat. June then gets suspicious and calls her superior, the lady police commissioner, who then calls Daniel. As if MI5 has to explain itself to Scotland Yard. You have to laugh.

In that conversation, it comes out that Billy didn't kill the girl with a gun or knife, he killed her with ketamine, meaning it may have been an accident. He had no history of violence and was only 17 at the time of the event, so he shouldn't have been given a life sentence regardless. So the story is already unwinding, and surprisingly it is unwinding in the direction I said from the beginning.

But however that turns out, this story has already collapsed, since we are now told Cosmo has been on a watch list for dealing in illegal arms, so we don't understand why he hasn't been arrested already. If MI5 knows who he is and what he has been doing, why can't they locate him? How did this plot to blow up Parliament or whatever get so far along already? As Ryan George, the super-easy, barely-an-inconvenience guy would say, “unclear”. Are we supposed to believe there are detonators available on ebay.co.uk or something? Or that this narcissist found a way to steal them from some military base in

Reading? He disguised himself as an ice-cream man and drove in through the front gates?

Anyway, we are supposed to believe that not only Scotland Yard, but our lady cop June have to sign off on this MI5 project. I guess because they are both ladies, and the men can't do anything without the women signing off on it. It is only fair.

At the same time, MI5 has watched a guy who they know is a bad guy enter the building, but done nothing. They are too busy video-phoning Scotland Yard. He is now randomly knocking on doors.

Finally we get to Cosmo, who does his photo analysis of the Muslim shooting, showing it was pasted up, indicating the whole clash was staged for some reason. Is he wrong? Well, this is the end of episode 2, so we don't how the script will go. Tune in for next week's exciting conclusion. Yawn.

That's about all I can stomach, but you already see it is just a warmed-over rehash of the fake news you are already having crammed down your throat 24/7, heavy with murders, divorce, terrorists, skinheads, crying fake mothers from actor's equity, and token women and blacks. In addition, you are in a gray and menacing place where the sun never shines and no one ever smiles.

And now where no one is attractive, either, even the actors. After a century of using pretty actors to lull you to sleep and herd you, that is being flipped as well, with all beauty being scrubbed on purpose. Beauty gives you a reason to live, even when it is just a surface beauty, but they can't have that any more. They need you completely debilitated, so all that had to go. You are being groomed for a dark cave deep underground, to be sure you don't break out and cause trouble. They took away your art a century ago, took away your science a bit later, then took away your lovers and family, then took away your health, and now they want to take your water and electricity and block out the Sun itself.

Why? Because you didn't do exactly what you were told. You didn't love the Phoenicians as they lied and stole from you, bowing down before them as superior race, so this is your punishment. As much as possible, they are going to take you down with them. But you don't have to go. It is up to you.

*Looks like an anagram to me. Gavin Vosniak=Ivan Saganikov? Or something like that. Somebody other than me may be referenced here.