

Mad at the Internet: The Collected Writings of Null

Joshua C. Moon (Null)

Re-opening Europa

COVID-19 shows how preposterously incapable the EU is at preparing, implementing, and announcing a coordinated response to any fucking thing.

The COVID-19 pandemic is probably the first serious challenge that the EU has ever faced that isn't just a single member state being a problem (i.e. Greece or the UK leaving). COVID-19 shows how preposterously incapable the EU is at preparing, implementing, and announcing a coordinated response to any fucking thing.

I have been in Serbia since February. I have a place to be in the Schengen. For the sake of argument, we will use Helsinki, Finland as my destination. This is not actual, but it's as good as any thing.

COVID hits, and Schengen (the big borderless system of virtually all EU member states) shits itself. Every member state starts closing down, sometimes even internal borders like Italy did. The entire agreement falls to the wayside in favor of an every-cunt-for-itself that is more in line with how sovereignties should be acting.

So the EC puts on its big boy pants and says: "We will re-do Schenge June 1st!", meant to re-open the internal borders of the EU. The way this works, the EC passes a suggestion and its up to member states to implement them. How do you think this goes? Luxembourg opens late March, and then every other country adopts it between June 1st and June 15th.

So Take 2. EC gets to put on its big boy pants and show the world what a strong, cohesive union the EU really is. Now they're going to open up to third nationals. How do you think this goes? They say: "We will open up to third nationals on July 1st!", on June 15th. They put out a list of countries (of which Serbia is included) from which people can fly in from to visit the EU without restriction.

The result: Most countries announce nothing, some countries announce their adoption of this suggestion the fucking DAY BEFORE the deadline. No country accepts this proposal at face value, and removes countries from the list. Some countries want reciprocal travel (i.e. China must allow Dutch citizens before Dutch allows Chinese citizens), some don't want to open at all, some want to open on later dates, some add airports some remove some. Some are completely open to third nationals.

How is this all communicated? Not at all. For the entire pandemic, I have been relying on the US EMBASSY SITES to rely information about what countries are allowed in and out of these Schengen states. Half-way through June, the EU launches this website which I found on some shitty fucking travel blog some retard runs in their spare time, with no official association to anything at all.
<https://reopen.europa.eu/en/>

And guess what? It's no better than the US embassy sites! It's often slower to update, because the EU has less of a fucking idea of what's going on in their member states than the US embassies does, because the charge d'affaires of the US missions frequently probe their counterparts to figure out what the fuck is going on before those counterparts relay information to Brussels.

So while Greece is open, Yugoslavia is not a part of the Schengen, making Greece an exclave of the Schengen. Luxembourg is open, but there are no direct flights to the Luxembourg airport from Belgrade. What happens if I fly to Athens, and then fly to Finland? Who knows! No one knows! Will that Schengen visa be accepted at Helsinki? Fuck if I know, fuck if the people in Athens would know.

There's also disagreement between the member states regarding residency. I am not a resident of Serbia, I am just on an extended visa. Some countries (Netherlands) are only allowing residents of these third nations, but what about retards like me stuck on a tourist visa? Greece, for instance, is allowing anyone who has spent the last 14 days in those countries, not necessarily residents.

So it literally looks like the best way to get into Finland right now would be to fly to PORTUGAL, get a Schengen visa there, and then rent a fucking car and drive it from Iberia up to Baltics into Helsinki, because there's no borders between the nations.

And since the situation is so confusing, it's also unlikely border guards know what the fuck is going on either. What they say is final, so if you get one in a bad mood you're fucked. When I was in Switzerland, I was seeing people get turned around for arriving one day early.

It's a fucking mess. Mark my words: the second push comes to shove with these assholes, this fragile little union would shatter immediately.

Using US Courts to Burn Money, for Free, Forever – Mad at the Internet

I have been sued by the same woman six times *pro se in forma pauperis*.

Pro se in forma pauperis means “for yourself while poor”. It is a combination of two distinct legal terms: *pro se*, when representing yourself without a lawyer, and *in forma pauperis*, when you file and are unable to pay court fees. The United States strives for equitable justice; we permit people too poor to hire attorneys to represent their own legal interests, and we allow the poorest people to avoid paying court fees when they docket a case.

Melinda Scott, the litigant, is a Virginian who converted to Judaism and has had several children with several different men. She calls herself a matriarch and the head of her household, but is financially supported by taxpayers. She has very little income outside of her welfare and her only ‘business’ is new age garbage catering to a sect of Judaism which she has invented herself as a self-purported “Torah scholar”.

She is worth nothing. Her personal income is nonexistent. The social security money she collects for her children cannot be garnished. Her primary residence and vehicle cannot be collected to pay the financial damages she causes.

Melinda represents herself, pays nothing to file, and spends her worthless time writing worthless legal arguments which must be taken as seriously by her targets as any other lawsuit. She has attempted to sue me or my LLC at least once a year every year for five years. For the first five times, she failed to state a claim and the judge threw out her cases *sua sponte* — without me needing to respond at all.

The courts operate on an honor system. If the plaintiff files a complaint which cites a law, alleges facts by which they are owed relief under that law, and docket it in the right court, that court will presume the claims are true. For example: “I was injured in this way, and I am owed damages under this statute, and this is the right jurisdiction for this claim”. Melinda has failed to meet this low, low bar of entry five times in a row.

Lawsuit number 6 comes and the courts allow it through for the first time. Through trial and error, she succeeded in passing the sniff test. Then, she lied by claiming I was properly served at a virtual mailbox. I was never served. I didn't reply to the lawsuit, because I had never been served, and she automatically receives a default judgement a few months later. She had finally won — at least temporarily.

I later receive a letter at my virtual office notifying me that I've lost a lawsuit. So, I lawyer up. I'm fortunate to have an attorney, [Matthew Hardin](#), who sympathizes with this sort of injustice. Pity only goes so far when it comes to legal expenses. Even being billed for fewer than half the hours spent working the case, it is still thousands of dollars. A typical retainer is \$5,000 and that covers just overturning the default judgement. There's still work to win the case.

I run a website called the Kiwi Farms. It is a forum about eccentric people on the Internet. Users of the forum were discussing a man who had been stalking Melinda. He joined to defend himself, and in these discussions mentioned her by name. She finds out about this somehow and immediately threatened me with legal action unless I deleted every post made by this man. I told her I would not censor my website and that she should be using these posts to augment her legal arguments against him. In the process, I become the first person to ever tell Melinda “no”, and she has been busy filing lawsuits against me ever since.

Meanwhile, Russell Greer is suing me in Utah, again *pro se in forma pauperis*. This time, it's for contributory copyright damages

and false light (a kind of defamation). Russell Greer is an ex-Mormon who considers himself a civil rights activist because he has a paralyzed face from a congenital disability ([Mobius syndrome](#)). He wants to legalize prostitution so that people with disabilities can pay for sex.

That's not what makes Russell Greer a laughingstock. Instead, it is his obsession with famous women. He has sued both Taylor Swift and Ariana Grande for not taking him out on dates. He would send them gifts, such as original lyrics for songs, and then expected them to reciprocate by giving him something he wants in return (a date / sex). He also has been convicted of cyberstalking a woman local to him.

After losing his first case against Swift, he self-published a book called *Why I Sued Taylor Swift: and How I Became Falsely Known as Frivolous, Litigious and Crazy* which included a full-color comic where she literally stabs him in the heart. He's a very funny guy, unintentionally.

Greer's other creative work is [Yo, Yovanna!](#), a love song directed at Yovanna Ventura, a Dominican actress and model. It's a generic sounding pop track he wrote the lyrics for, but paid someone else to perform (his condition prevents him from verbally articulating himself clearly). This song ends up posted on the Kiwi Farms and is harshly criticized for being creepy. Greer responded to this criticism by sending me a DMCA complaint demanding that the song be removed. I refused and told him that it's being used fairly for the purposes of criticism and ridicule. He escalates the matter to the courts by suing me personally and "Kiwi Farms, a website."

Greer tends to use the court system as punishment. Displease him, and he will try to litigate you into doing what he wants. Humorously, when he sued Taylor Swift, he took her to small claims court. These courts typically try to keep costs down by forcing people to represent themselves instead of hiring attorneys. His strategy was to force TayTay to show up in person and deal with him. Instead, Greg Skordas was allowed to represent her, however, and Greer

never managed to set up his romantic date in a Utah small claims court.

Greg Skordas is a Utah attorney and was the Democratic nominee for Utah Attorney General in 2020. He has represented Taylor Swift, Ariana Grande, and yours truly. Greer thusly considers Skordas his nemesis and has harassed his family over Facebook.

Greer's complaint against me was two-fold: he alleged that I contributed to theft of his song by allowing it to be posted (using Napster as a comparison), and that I put him in "false light" when a sentence alleging Greer had "victims" was featured on the front page of my website. His actual legal argument is: he was only convicted of cyberstalking once, so he has only a single victim, thus claiming he has multiple victims is defamatory. This is not a joke.

The court upheld that [Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act](#) protects me from damages caused by user generated content on my platform. Section 230 is important and provides protections for alt-tech just as it does for big tech. Any proposals to amend Section 230 should be considered very carefully.

Skordas's firm has competently represented my interests in Utah. Greer's case was dismissed, and so were his post-mortem motions to have the case reopened. He is now appealing the decision in a higher court. Skordas has also been generous in not charging me for all billable hours, but even half of an attorney's bill is a lot of money.

Melinda's lawsuit has also been thrown out and she is also appealing. She actively posts on my forum, despite suing me over alleged emotional distress it has caused her. In these posts, she has stated intentions to appeal all the way up to the United States Supreme Court. When they refuse to hear it, she will file a new lawsuit. If she can't file in Virginia, she'll do it in a random state, where I would have to find a new attorney who may not be as sympathetic towards my situation as Hardin and willing to save me on billable hours.

I am in a difficult position. I could try to get a judgement for attorney's fees. Ironically, this costs money to file. Once I have my judgement, I have to go back to court to try enforcing it.

With Greer, I believe he works a job and I can garnish his wages. He might also have money I could try and take. His family is wealthy and they might choose to bail him out of debt. I could also ask for the rights to *Yo, Yovanna!* and write that off as part of his debt. Then, I could make money with it. My users would probably buy a vinyl press of *Yo, Yovanna!* and it would be good fun.

With Melinda, it's not so simple. She has no job, she has no supporting family, she has nothing but her children (and indentured child labor is off the table these days). She has two books I could win the rights to, but nothing as funny as *Yo, Yovanna!*. I would have to actually physically repossess her belongings after winning the power to do so in the debtor's court. If I send a debt collector into her home, I would ask he wear a camera.

Maybe a video 'wall of shame' on the site would deter future *pro se in forma paupis* litigants. Maybe it wouldn't. It's a gamble, and it's a gamble with money I don't really want to gamble with.

What other option do I have?

There is no point in moving my company out of the US. As long as I am American and I have property in the US, a default judgement can be used to take that property or garnish my income.

Labeling repeat offenders as "vexatious litigants" is hard and it's infrequently used. A vexatious litigant has limitations on how they may litigate (for instance, they can only file litigation with an attorney representing them or must have all complaints reviewed by a judge before they can be filed with the court and served). This would not stop them from simply litigating in a different jurisdiction. A vexatious litigant in Utah can still file lawsuits in Nevada. It would also cost money to litigate each person and ask they be classified as a vexatious litigant, and it would not be a guarantee to win.

There is no criminal element. A judge could find a litigant in contempt of court, but the judge would first have to instruct them to do something they refuse to do. Simply abusing the court system like this does not result in criminal charges.

I could represent myself *pro se* to try and reduce expense. I cannot, however, represent my LLC *pro se*. Any lawsuit involving an entity that is not my person cannot be represented by me. These lawsuits usually identify an entity which is not myself. It is still a gamble. What if I do a bad job, then lose? I would have to hire an attorney and still be stuck with those bad legal arguments made out of naivety. Fighting my own words could end up costing more than an attorney would have to begin with.

I have loss conditions. I can only spend so much money. They file for free, and there's no way to recoup losses. Unless I simply make enough money to deal with this forever, it will be a winning strategy, eventually.

Our country rewards only its biggest burdens.

1. Scott v. Moon (2017)
Wise/Norton General District Court (GV1700529-00)
2. Scott v. Wise County Commonwealths, et al. (2017)
U.S. District Court for the Western District of Virginia (C2:17CV00023)
3. Scott v. Moon (2017)
Wise County Circuit Court (CL17000827-00)
4. Scott v. Carlson, et al. (2018)
U.S. District Court for the Western District of Virginia (2:18CV47)
5. Scott v. Moon, et al (2019)
U.S. District Court for the Western District of Virginia (2:19CV5)
6. Greer v. Moon (2019)
U.S. District Court District Court for Utah, Central Division (2:20-cv-00647-TC)
7. Scott v. Wise County Department of Social Services, et al. (2020)

U.S. District Court for the Western District of Virginia, Big
Stone Gap Division (2:20CV00014)

Brave New World

I've spent the entire weekend migrating over a year of my podcasts from the blog hosted by Dick Masterson on New Project 2 to a new, self-hosted site. If you didn't know, New Project 2 was meant to be a crowdfunding alternative to Patreon. It was [unceremoniously executed by MasterCard](#) after the LLC was added to MATCH, MasterCard's secretive, proprietary list of banned merchants who are not allowed to participate in the global economy and cannot accept money from anyone wanting to use their credit card or debit card.

So now that we're on something that can't be monetized and is hosted on my own hardware, let's talk about gay people and the end goals of the global elite. I invite you to watch this [40-minute-long video](#) by Endeavour.

Endeavour explains very succinctly in this video what I understand to be the "New World Order" and what the powerful want: to solidify their power forever. To do this, they must tear down competing power structures and prevent any chance of competition.

Look at what banks and other multi-billion dollar companies and media enterprises are investing in.

- Mass immigration and racial justice.
- Female empowerment and birth control.
- LGBT culture and progressive science.
- Internationalism and cosmopolitanism.

These policies erode a country's culture and reduce the value of labor. Most importantly, they undermine the nuclear family. The nuclear family is the most important component of western society, because without it there is no way to propagate language, race, tradition, and culture. These are the fundamental components of

tribalism which make up the nation, which is the primary opponent to internationalism.

On the issue of labor: women drop the value of all labor down to half as the female workforce participation approaches 100%. For every per cent of foreign population introduced into the economy, the value of labor drops as much. If the working age population of a country is one million men, then a million women enter the work force, and an additional two-hundred thousand immigrants come in, an employer now has twenty-two candidates for a position that used to have ten. That employer can get away with paying a lot less for that position than he would have before. If the immigrants require a job to stay in the country, they can't refuse any offer and the bar is lowered for all applicants.

It used to be possible for a single man working in a factory in the United States to earn enough money to support a family of four on his own property. After the rise of female workforce participation, the introduction of millions of foreign workers, and the off-shoring of American production, no longer can a working man support his family by himself. Home ownership and children have shifted to luxuries instead of the very foundation of a fulfilled life.

Jobs are also continuously moving towards metropolitan spaces like LA and NYC where space is a premium. Even with both partners in a marriage working, few can afford a third bedroom for a child while in the city. The alternative is quitting their jobs and moving into the suburbs, which is a life altering risk and often a ruinous point in marriages made with career women.

Foreign labor creates an answer to a problem that foreign labor causes. As the average American couple can no longer afford a family due to the devaluation of labor, the lack of reproduction leads to a lack of labor, and to fill the gaps countries increase immigration. These issues are cyclical and compounding.

Women are happiest as mothers, yet most western women would resent that statement. They have been told since childhood that what they need is a college degree, a job, and independent wealth.

The desire to not become dependent on a man is an embedded fear in virtually all western women coming of age today. Birth control and abortion have made accidental families (and then the accidental discovery of the fulfillment of parenthood) a less likely occurrence. Abortion is increasingly upheld as a good and empowering thing, and a rite of passage in a new secular religion which is replacing old traditions.

We observe that the LGBT are gluttonous consumers. They are at the forefront of pop culture and demand representation in the things they consume, which is a major (but not the only) reason we see homosexuality as a part of all new American media. The transgenders in particular love consumerist escapism more than most people for obvious reasons. They opt-in to hormone therapies and excruciating cosmetic surgeries which put many on pain management and hormone prescriptions until they die.

Gays have an added benefit of being non-reproductive, except via adoption, which increases the likelihood the adopted child also becomes gay or otherwise indoctrinated into a lifestyle of non-reproduction. In high schools today, being queer is *en vogue*, and many teenagers now pretend to be gay just to be cool. The gay is the ideal outcome of the indoctrination that these children, and everybody else in the United States, is exposed to each day. Unable to reproduce, very willing to evangelize the gay lifestyle, hostile to the nuclear family, and easily satiated by materialism.

All this promotes internationalism. As foreign born populations grow and mix with the local populations, the culture changes and becomes alien to its own past. As progressive, secular faiths overtake religion, traditionalists lose power and arguments for a borderless society become more popular. Race dilutes naturally as miscegenation becomes norm. Language itself becomes malleable and freely edited by media and government via newly popular hate speech legislation and social media censorship.

As the peoples of many nations blend into a genetically indeterminate mass speaking an adulterated form of English from a committee approved dictionary, listening to the same American

music and watching the same Hollywood movies, in support of the same social welfare systems and thinking along the same progressive lines, why would we even need to have countries? Why would we not just federate our nations into unions and delegate power to global committee?

From that point, the entire western world can consolidate into an oligarchy of bankers and media executives with puppet governments and strategically positioned upper class pawns representing various minority and majority interests without any real power. It will be impossible for the people to stand up to the establishment because they will have no unifying facets that make up the pillars of tribalism. The military/police will be a well-trained and well-paid group of equally diverse contractors capable of killing innocents on command to keep their twenty-year pensions. While the lack of tribalism impedes rights-seekers, it will empower this military class to commit atrocities. They will feel less empathy for enemies of the state they share no race or culture with, and who have been reduced from human beings to ideological radicals threatening the new world peace with their tired, old ideas.

I have no answers on preventing this. People over 40 especially are complacent in this change. The politically conscience of these older people are either former hippies who love this idea of internationalization and so-called world peace, or they are conservatives who believe in 'melting pot' American nationalism. These neocons ascribe the current crisis to the old ones: we are being invaded by Soviet-era communists, making it purely ideological. Or, they believe Islam alone is the problem, as they support Israel for the sake of ushering in the rapture and spreading democracy.

Trump in particular represents a pacifier. An ineffective politician, promoting civic nationalism, and one of the most ardent Zionists in American history (so much so, 8 of his 10 grandchildren as Jewish). As much as progressives complain about him, he represents no real problem to the status quo. The overreaction to Trump is merely an excuse to radicalize his opposition and pursue more aggressive censorship in the immediate future. Trump, in retrospect, might

have accelerated this degradation through outrage more than Clinton ever could by trying to pass legislation and fighting within the parameters of the political system.

I've thought very hard on what should be done, and I am sure on only one thing: focusing on the macro trends of the world without power to change it is only effective in hurting yourself.

This is my plan for myself.

- Focus on myself first, then a nuclear family, then everybody else.
- Save money, and diversify into property, metals, and crypto.
- Settle into a place outside of a city that I would die for.

I'm also considering "lip service to a religion", but that might wait until I have kids. I don't think I can pick up a god at this point. It'd be purely for the opportunities such fraternity provides children.

As for what I currently do, I will continue onward as long as it remains fun, and as long as it doesn't negatively impact my plans.

Take it easy.

Where the Sidewalk Ends: The Death of the Internet

The Internet is becoming smaller, fragmenting down national borders, and succumbing to regulations imposed by governments and various special interests.

An internet is a network made of smaller networks. *The Internet* is the single international network you are using right now. The Internet is enormous. The Internet spans from research facilities in Antarctica up into outer space. The Internet is how I'm writing this in Europe for a website in the United States which is accessible almost everywhere in the world.

The Internet is also very fragile. It has many moving parts and drives the politics of our world today. For this reason, it will die, and it will die very soon. Our big-I Internet is being broken apart and will soon become many little-i internets. Every large country or trade union will have its own local and strictly regulated internet. Connections between internets will occur on the vestigial remains of the big-I Internet, requiring a special business permits to access.

China and the DPRK already work like this. If you want to communicate through the Great Firewall, you must have a registered business and specific need to do so. Russia has recently [tested isolating itself from the Internet](#). The European Union continues to pursue aggressive censorship measures like [TERREG](#), which would allow any member state of the EU to demand a web service hosted in any other EU member remove content within one hour, or be fined up to 4% of their global turnover in the last business year. The Internet cannot survive this sort of meddling for long.

While more centralized governments have the authority to shape their internet as they see fit, our politicians in the west have cumbersome obstacles to overcome, such as constitutional protections and a judicial process. Until these can be discarded, the government can simply bypass the courts and have companies to do the job for them. Companies are not restricted by the constitution in the same way as government, so as megacorp and government interests continue to mesh into one giant malaise, one can act for the other without causing problems. Even if the US Government cannot legislate a vague concept like 'hate speech', nothing stops the large social media companies from doing it for them.

“Build your own Internet“

To demonstrate how delicate the Internet is, I will enumerate the moving parts required to get content to your screen. Keep in mind that if any of these parts break, you're off the Internet until you can replace it. A website can function only with the assent of, and collaboration with, dozens of other companies. Each of these can be a different company with a different ethos.

First, you need a server. Most people trying to get a website up cannot afford one, so they rent a 'virtual private server' (VPS) from a company like DigitalOcean or Linode. These are big companies and will censor offensive content. If you're lucky, they won't just delete your VPS without warning.

Second, you need an IP address and an 'autonomous system number' (ASN). These are allocated by Regional Internet Registries (RIRs). ARIN is the RIR for the United States, and there are 5 in total for the entire world. If ARIN says you don't get any Internet resources, you have no appeals process because they are a private company, and you *need* their resources. When you rent a server from a company, these issues are handled for you. If you're not allowed to use a VPS, you have to do it all yourself. It's both very expensive and very technical.

Third, you need an upstream service provider (ISP) to connect you to the Internet. Your upstream is important, because you have to physically connect your server to their network. Your area has a limited number of available ISPs, and they are private companies which can terminate your service at any time for any reason or no reason. ColoCrossing in Buffalo physically unplugged my servers in 2019 for hosting the Kiwi Farms and Encyclopedia Dramatica.

Fourth, you need peers. Peers are other ISPs that talk to your ISP. Peering is how the Internet actually works. When data traverses the Internet most of its route is done through third party networks, not your upstream directly. If your content is offensive enough that peers start refusing to deliver content to or from your IPs, you can essentially be cut out from the world wide web. NTT refuses to peer with any company that peers with my subnet, for instance.

Fifth, you'll need a domain name. All the above simply routes traffic to an IP. While you can run a website with just an IP (see [1.1.1.1](#)), most people would prefer to type in "zerohedge.com". This requires the blessing of two more companies: The registrar which leases the domain to the customer, and the Network Information Center (NIC) which owns the top-level domain. As an example: ZeroHedge uses EasyDNS as its registrar, and all .COM domains are controlled by Verisign. Getting permission from Verisign to sell .COM addresses costs \$3,500 and an additional \$4,000 a year. Without this permission, you must rely on a 3rd party registrar for your domain, and they may seize your domain for any reason or no reason at all.

When DreamHost (a company I bought my first domain from when I was 16 in April 2009) tells me "you can't host kiwifarms.net with us anymore and we're closing your account with us in 14 days", it puts me in a difficult spot. If I just dump Kiwi Farms's domain on another company, then they may be less kind and simply seize the domain! Nothing stops them from doing so.

I've moved the Kiwi Farms domain to Cloudflare's domain registrar. This is a very risky decision, because in the past the mob would direct its noise at both Dreamhost and Cloudflare. Now, there's a more centralized point of failure. I am ordinarily afraid to even say

the name Cloudflare, as if speaking it aloud could remind them I exist and compel them to step on me.

Why is Cloudflare special?

To recap: I own my own servers (roughly \$20,000 in equipment). I also own my own IPs and ASN (\$2,000/yr). I have my upstream (\$500/mo). I could become my own .NET domain registrar (\$3,500 + \$4,000/yr). I have, to the best of my ability, within the limits of a 28-year-old's budget, "built my own Internet".

Despite all that, the Internet has one more weak point: Denial of Service Attacks. These attacks use compromised computers to send massive amounts of junk data to a single point, blotting out legitimate traffic and potentially overwhelming target devices.

DoS attacks are cheap. Botnet resellers are easy to find. They're easy to use. However, they are not cheap to mitigate. A 10Gbps attack costs less than \$100 for a month, but a 10Gbps line costs \$750/mo. 10Gbps-capable routers costs thousands. That is already excessive, but attacks frequently top 100Gbps or even 1000Gbps. Few companies can handle this job. Those companies come under intense political scrutiny. Cloudflare is the biggest, and I use them.

Websites that many people would prefer to stop existing, such as mine, are kept protected by the whims of one man. I've never met him and I've never spoken to him. I am sure he knows I exist only because of the outrage directed at him that my website causes.

Matthew Prince, the CEO of Cloudflare, is an outlier in the elite of Silicon Valley. He is the one person whose default position on censorship is "no". Cloudflare has removed two websites explicitly aligned with neo-Nazism, but ordinarily, they refuse to buckle to the mob. Why? I don't know. Maybe he's just libertarian. Maybe he wants the Internet to be free, like it used to be. Maybe he's a government informant (there's a popular conspiracy theory that Cloudflare is a large man-in-the-middle spyware operation). Even if he is, I don't care. My website is legal and there's nothing on it that's not public anyways.

Prince is just one man, however, and I have no doubt that when he retires he will be replaced by less of a man. Some political activists who endeavor to censor the Internet are simply waiting for the day he's gone. There are other DDoS mitigation services, but they're much smaller, often not as capable, and not in as strong a position to say "no". When he is out of power, it will cause a vacuum that will negatively impact the health of the Internet, and he will not be readily replaced by anything.

What few alternatives to Cloudflare exist are politically active. Voxility, Path, X4B, and others are competitors. Voxility is one of the worst in terms of being politically active. X4B is in Australia and beholden to strange, foreign laws about speech which are irreconcilable with the United States. Path peers with NTT and are unavailable to me because of NTT's embargo on my subnet. DDoS-Guard is a Russian alternative, but dealing with Mother Russia has its own issues.

"Build your own Internet somewhere else?"

The Internet is developing its own herd immunity to controversial material. Once a certain number of ISPs say they won't peer you, you're screwed. These companies are consolidating all the time, your list of options are smaller every year, and the group of people actually making decisions shrinks with it.

No company has management with spine. People just want to make as much money as possible and with as little noise as possible. Few companies will take a financial hit on principle. The mob takes advantage of this to censor the Internet with great effect. This is a precursor of things to come.

What if I moved everything out of the US to a 'free' country like Russia? Now I have Russian hardware, Russian IPs, a Russian upstream, Russian peers, Russian DDoS mitigation, and a nice .RU domain to top it off. What happens next?

Assuming there were no issues with local laws and government (there would be) and assuming I would not be extorted by officials,

it would only kick the can down down the road. Just as moving VPS companies kicked the can to the next VPS company. Just as getting my own IPs kicked the can to upstream. Just as getting a stable upstream kicked the can to DDoS mitigation. This would kick the can another few years down the road to the upcoming Internet schism, where my website will suddenly be on the Russian side of the new regional internets.

I have spent thousands of dollars consulting with attorneys, solicitors, and advocates across the world regarding the legal protections of Internet services in their countries. Whatever is out there, it is not better than what is back at home.

We must resolve to fixing the problems we have here in the United States instead of trying to offload the responsibilities of the Internet and our freedoms onto a random country. Russia will not go out of its way to protect American's free speech.

“Whatever America hopes to bring to pass in the world must first come to pass in the heart of America.” — Dwight D. Eisenhower

The Broader Impact

In 2007, thousands of websites competed for traffic. By 2014, that number was 35 ([source](#)). In 2021, Google and YouTube (subsidiaries of Alphabet LLC) make up enough traffic by themselves to [beat the next 30 top websites combined](#).

ISPs are consolidating too, and telecom as an industry is harder to break into. You will need to lay cables to do business, and most areas have one-company rights for those cables. Meanwhile, Google and Amazon set up their own infrastructure and get what they need. Google's Cloud and Amazon's AWS are nation-state sized internets by themselves, controlling a massive amount of global traffic.

We have a competition crisis. Think of all the startups hoping to compete with Google, YouTube, and Twitter that have come and gone in the last few years. Nobody can stand up to this tide, and

the few willing to try are destroyed by the whims of these mega-corporations (enriched with government contracts) who have no interest in seeing ordinary people challenge their absolute, totalitarian control over all online media.

For every Kiwi Farms, Gab, 8chan, and Bitchute which tried to deal with these problems head on, there are a hundred others who (wisely) realized at the first set of hurdles that this was a challenge out of the budget and reach of an ordinary person. Our Internet could be so vibrant and healthy if the artificial limitations imposed by third parties were removed.

What can be done?

The Legislative Fix

[Section 230](#) protects all of these service providers from civil liability for hosting my website. Few of them are willing to wield it like a shield to resist censorship, but rather as a sword to cut down with impunity. 230(c)(1) gives them immunity from civil action from what they *do* host, while 230(c)(2) gives immunity to civil actions from people they choose to censor.

The legislative solution (altering Section 230 to discourage censorship) requires editing Paragraph (2) without killing Paragraph (1) in the process. This requires a surgical precision. While there are [many proposals for changing Section 230](#), they are terrible.

Republicans tend to clumsily address the issue while either not fixing the core problem or just creating new ones. [Sen. Hagerty's bill](#), for instance, rewrites Section 230 as Section 232 and provides sweeping common carrier rules and consumer protections, while exempting broadband providers. Thereby, he encumbers providers while not addressing the core issues at all.

Democrats tend to hijack the issue, making services liable only for 'extremist content' and 'hate speech'. See [Sen. Mark Werner's "SAFE Tech" act](#).

I am extremely hesitant to ever suggest modifying Section 230. However, simply striking or modifying a single paragraph – 230(c)(2) – would be enough to allow us to sue businesses interfering with our business. There are some proposals to try this:

1. Sen. Kelly Loeffler's 9-month-old [Stop Suppressing Speech Act of 2020](#) with zero cosponsors. This removes vague wording so that providers can't remove everything they want. House counterpart [H.R.7808](#) has some traction.
2. Sen. Wicker's [Online Freedom and Viewpoint Diversity Act](#), which has a similar 230(c)(2) rewrite and more cosponsors. It also modifies a definition so that upstream providers are more liable for censorship and business interference.

These bills are now mostly idle after Trump left office, but they're still there if you're eager to write your representatives.

The Financial Fix

The issue of financial censorship, which I wrote about in [Section 230 Isn't The Problem, Payment Networks Are](#), is present here as well. In summary: MasterCard, Visa, Discover, and Amex controls almost all consumer spending in the United States, and they will frequently stop payments to specific websites, companies, and individuals with intention of destroying them financially for political purposes.

A lot of small companies don't have to choice to say "no" to the mob, because payment networks will say "yes" for them. Regulating these payment networks, setting up an alternative (the Federal Reserve is trying to set up an instant bank-to-bank transfer service called [FedNow](#)), and mainstreaming alternative currency payments (cryptocurrency or even precious metals) are ways around this financial censorship.

At the very end of the Trump administration, the Comptroller of Currency passed regulation titled [Fair Access to Financial Services](#). The week Biden entered office, [it was put on permanent hold](#). This would have been a huge step towards alt-tech gaining a foothold.

The Onion Fix

Some people suggest moving to a .ONION domain on the [Tor Network](#), which requires a special browser to access. However, I believe that all US legal content should be accessible by a regular person with an ordinary web browser, and found without hassle on search engines. Allowing our speech to be covered up, hidden, and sidelined is a losing strategy.

Tor is great for protecting people accessing websites. By hiding the route traffic takes, people in non-free countries can find censored materials safely through Tor.

Websites can set up what's called a "hidden service". Having a hidden service bypasses requirements for domain name registration and hides the origin of traffic, making it effectively impossible for anyone to do anything about content hosted on Tor. There is some wisdom in this, but hiding minimizes the accessibility of those services and simply yields more ground to the mob. Mainstream browsers like [Brave](#) natively supporting access to the Tor network is helping on this issue.

There are Tor-like services attempting to use cryptocurrency concepts to create a strong, private network which has all the benefits of Tor, plus built-in tools to circumvent financial censorship. I pay attention to [OXEN](#) in particular, but it is not yet a drop-in replacement for Tor or a ready solution for general purpose websites.

The Real Fix

The most powerful and readily accessible fix to censorship is also completely free and available to everyone. More than anything, what our free Internet requires to stay free is for free men to have the courage to stand up to the mob, and use their positions to be the change they want to see in the world. We need more than one Matthew Prince if we are going to keep our big-I Internet. All anyone ever needed to do is tell these people is "no", as in: **No**, I

will not take down anything without a court order. It feels good to say it, trust me.

Section 230 isn't the problem, Payment Networks are – Mad at the Inte...

Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act is one of the most important pieces of legislation in American history. Passed into law in 1996, it has overseen the entirety of the consumer Internet's development. Its premise is simple: Internet service providers and platform operators are not responsible for civil damages that result from user-generated content that they host or manage. These protections are why the United States is the first choice for hosting any digital service. Without them, the entire world would suffer a less free Internet.

I have operated a controversial website called the *Kiwi Farms* for 8 years and was [featured in ZeroHedge](#) in 2019 after telling New Zealand police I would not be surrendering my user's information to them. My website thrives and doubles in size each year, primarily thanks to Section 230. I can allow my users to say almost anything they want without having to worry about being sued for what they say. Without these essential protections, I would not be able to host in the United States.

Unfortunately, Section 230 has been defamed as the reason Facebook, Twitter, Google, *et al* behave the way they do. This is not true. These businesses censor because they have personal motivations to do so. More importantly, they have financial motivations to do so.

I hope to convince a reasonable person that:

1. Payment networks must be regulated to give fair access.
2. Section 230 is essential and modifying it harms online speech.
3. Big tech does not need Section 230, but you do.
4. You should learn how to use cryptocurrencies right now.

The payment networks are more powerful than big tech. Without the consent of all four major payment networks to stay in business, even mighty tech giants are vulnerable to lose billions of dollars in revenue. The various agreements enforced by the four major payment networks (MasterCard, Visa, Amex, and Discover) impose rules that any business wanting to exist in the digital economy must obey. Not all these rules are written.

The big payment networks like to stay out of the public eye. They avoid attention by using blacklists which they claim only banks can add to, but which they manage and share. You also never deal with the payment network directly. An eCommerce site passes your credit card information to a “payment gateway”, which is plugged into a “payment processor”, and that payment processor handles communications with the payment networks. Each of these are usually different companies. When you get banned from processing payments, you are told so by your payment gateway or payment processor, but the decision can come from much higher up. If it were, you’d be lucky to find out.

Consider a company like Patreon. They are an online crowdfunding service which handles donations from many supporters to many online content creators. Patreon has its own rules, uses Stripe as a payment gateway and payment processor, agrees to Stripe’s terms of service, and then Stripe coordinates with all major payment networks which each have their own set of agreements. That means **every creator on Patreon must obey six different sets of rules**. If the gateway were its own company, it would be seven. It is no wonder so many people get banned, as only the most tepid and inoffensive content creators could hope to meet so many different standards!

Patreon must keep Stripe happy to stay in business, and Stripe must keep all four payment networks happy to stay in business. If any one of MasterCard, Visa, Amex, or Discover pass a rule, then it affects the entire downstream ecosystem. If Discover (5% of the market) says an industry or behavior is prohibited, then Stripe must enforce that rule on all the merchants on their service (even merchants who do not process Discover). If Discover were to cut

ties with Stripe, then Stripe would lose at least 5% of their transactions over night and any merchants who do want to process Discover cards. That is a large and dramatic blow to any company operating on small margins.

I do not claim it is MasterCard's fault that Twitter banned Trump. I am sure Twitter makes many stupid decisions all on its own. The problem is that **these rules—how they are enforced, the secrecy in which they are enforced, and unappealable finality of these decisions—stifle competition.** Startups like Gab quickly find themselves told they are not allowed to make money. This problem has never existed before on the scale that it does now.

This phenomenon transcends the type of startup. All alt-tech is trodden upon equally. Patreon competitor *New Project 2* was first banned from a payment processor at the demand of Discover, then **after finding a new payment processor was put on MATCH (the MasterCard blocklist), prohibiting the company from ever finding another payment processor.** If Dick Masterson (the owner of NP2) made a new company to try and get around MATCH for the purpose of continuing NP2, **he would very likely find his person on that blocklist directly, ending all his businesses at once.**

These blocklists, and the risk management factors which decide who goes on them, are “trade secrets” and you cannot even sue to figure out why you were added to them. *New Project 2* was **blacklisted for “Violation of Standards”**, which prohibits it from even using so-called high-risk processors. Nobody knows what “Violation of Standards” means. Dick only found some details of *New Project 2*'s blacklisting because he called the banks and annoyed the right people for days until they reluctantly admitted who was actually at fault. Payment networks claim they do not add merchants to the blacklists, and that only partner banks can, but they will call these banks and tell them to do it on their behalf, and the banks are not in any position to refuse.

PayPal has not been mentioned so far, but rest assured they are one of the most egregious and will drop you first. BitChute, a video platform competing with YouTube, was banned from

PayPal. **ZeroHedge itself is banned from using PayPal.** To this day, because of my association with the Kiwi Farms, I cannot use the Uber app to get a taxi because Uber uses PayPal to process credit cards and I am banned from PayPal.

Before we regulate the Internet, why don't we try to regulate the payment networks? Give the market a fair chance at competing with tech giants by enforcing fair access to credit and debit card processing!

The Office of the Comptroller of Currency proposed new regulation which would require banks (and the services they run, including payment networks) to stop industry blacklisting and require specific examples of risk to ban a merchant from processing cards. It was called *Fair Access to Financial Services* (OCC-2020-0042-0001).

These “fair access” rules [were finalized on January 14th, 2021](#). They were set to take effect on April 1st. Placing this on April Fool's Day was a bit too prescient, because the Chairman immediately resigned after passing this rule, and **the fair access rule was formally put on an indefinite pause on January 28th, 2021 – one week after Biden assumed office.**

This rule was politicized as a way for Republicans to force poor, innocent multinational trillion dollar banking institutions to do business with ‘evil’ industries like oil drilling and the NRA. The Chairman of the OCC made note that it should be an act of congress to regulate those industries, not unilaterally enforced by nameless risk management committees behind closed doors.

It is unlikely that payment network regulation will find bipartisan support. The payment networks do a good job of picking their targets. Controversial but left-leaning organizations like *Nation of Islam* appear to have no issue processing cards, despite their virulent antisemitism rivaling anything found on Gab. Perhaps if *Planned Parenthood* suddenly needed cash upfront to perform abortions things would change. Until then, **free speech will be clustered alongside weapons and Alaskan oil prospecting as an industry that is safe to punch down at.**

So, if bankers are above regulation for now, why not regulate social media?

We have already amended Section 230 and it sucked. There are holes poked into Section 230 protections already. When Section 230 was first passed in 1996, Congress effectively legalized piracy. Platforms were immunized even from copyright infringement damages. So, if pirates could stay anonymous, there was no one to sue for distributing copies of movies.

To patch the piracy loophole, in 1998, we passed the DMCA. This act created the process for the copyright takedown system that is infamous on websites like YouTube. Rights Holders can now take down copyrighted content and sue the services directly if they refuse to comply. Unfortunately, the process created is so sloppy and awful it is a continuous nightmare for a host like me (and everyone on YouTube) to deal with.

For one, there is no recourse for flagrant or malicious DMCA takedowns. There is no requirement that the person sending the DMCA prove they own the copyright, to have a copyright ID, to be an attorney, or anything to that effect. I routinely receive copyright complaints that I must take seriously for content they don't even own. *OnlyFans* (a Grand Cayman company) makes it clear in their Terms of Service that they do not own the content they host. Despite that, *OnlyFans* routinely sends me DMCA takedown notices for their 3rd party content through a man out of California who is not an attorney. This is a total farce, and there is nothing I can do. I still must reply with a counter notice, but they never take it to court and I never even hear back. I have no legal recourse against this abuse.

This will be *everything* online if further loopholes were carved into Section 230. **Imagine if defamation was handled the same way the copyright system is.** Random trolls could issue takedowns for your Tweets and Facebook posts. You would have to send a legal counter notice with your real name and address to the troll to reinstate your messages. There would be no validations in place.

Your speech would be at the mercy of the whims of insane people online.

In this environment where platforms could be held liable for things said on their websites, **only the richest of them could afford survival.** I am currently dealing with two lawsuits. They are completely baseless, insane ramblings from insane people, but they will still cost a lot of money to deal with. There is no way to get fees from them because they have nothing to take. Without Section 230, I would lose a layer of protection enabling me to deal with these lawsuits for much less than it would if we had to take it to trial. It would destroy the site, especially since I cannot charge cards normally to generate consistent revenue to fund my defenses with.

President Trump and people in general seem desperate just for revenge. The rabble directed towards Section 230 is out of anger. “If only this blow were delivered and 230 were repealed,” they think, “Twitter would be plunged into financial ruin overnight.” Maybe a Samson Option is what we need?

Unfortunately, it is not so simple. **Twitter would adapt and become more censorious to reduce its civil liabilities.** All US search engines would have their results curated by anyone willing to complain about defamation—including, and perhaps especially, by public figures with something to hide. The smaller and less profitable sites hosted out of the US (Gab, Parler, 4chan, 8kun, Kiwi Farms, Encyclopedia Dramatica, thousands of small, federated services and communities) would either be destroyed outright, forced go private, or driven out of the United States. It would be a total disaster for the little guys.

[Jack Posobiec made a comment recently](#) that Justice Clarence Thomas had ruled Section 230 was unconstitutional. This is not true. The opinion he cited as ‘sauce’ was not case law, but rather an opinion in the strictest sense. Thomas did not even claim Section 230 was unconstitutional. This misinformation was seen hundreds of thousands of times and further defamed the public

perception of a law we rely on to even conduct these conversations about Section 230 online.

So, if we can't regulate the banks and Section 230 is actually good, what can we do? What Clarence Thomas actually suggested was that we might have to regulate the supermassive tech companies as 'common carriers' or utilities. Regulating only the largest social media networks could work. **You can either be a monopoly, or you can be unregulated, you cannot be both.** I maintain that regulating payment networks *first* would be ideal, but that will not happen.

There is some hope that [FedNow](#), an atrociously named US answer to SEPA, could offer some relief to this payment network bottleneck on speech. I am not optimistic for it, but it is good for more people to know it is supposedly in development.

Cryptocurrencies bypass the payment network bottleneck now. The more people who know how to transact in cryptocurrency, the freer the Internet will be. Sites like [buybitcoinworldwide.com](#) (not an affiliate url) contain simple guides on how to get into the ecosystem regardless of your country. **You do not have to invest any money in. Just learn how crypto works, how to get it, and how to send it. That knowledge cannot be taken away from you**—and it might prove useful, sooner rather than later.

Buying Freedom with Alternative Money

Fiat money is evil and must be replaced. The system that governs us does not want people to have the option not to comply with it. It controls us with its money. I hope to encourage readers to reduce their dependence on government issued money through precious metals and cryptocurrencies.

The US dollar officially stopped backing its money with gold in 1971. [This decision has been a disaster](#) for our quality of life by every metric.

Without this limiting factor, the government can print money which devalues the existing money people already have. It gives this new money to banks directly and uses it to settle debts with government contractors. These banks and contractors are the friends of those in government (Amazon, Tesla, and others reporting record profits during the pandemic as example). So, through inflation, we effectively remove wealth from the average person and give it to bankers and plutocrats who already own you. Alan Greenspan, 13th chair of the Federal Reserve, described this in his essay [Gold and Economic Freedom](#).

The digital market presents new opportunities for the government to stalk us and control us. While we could anonymously pay in cash before, e-commerce eliminates privacy and enables the production of [algorithms designed to know us better than we know ourselves](#) by studying our shopping habits. Privacy tools like VPNs and adblockers do not factor in as domestic espionage records our customer and banking information directly.

Government's monopoly on money also enables it to exclude anyone or anything from the economy. Russia and her citizens are now banned from doing business with the west. This year we saw truckers in Canada have their assets frozen and money raised to

help them stopped from transferring to those who need it. While these are both recent, we have been seeing the banks close accounts and deny merchant services (like payment processors) to dissident organizations, companies, and even individuals for over a decade. These actions effectively bankrupt people hoping to challenge the status quo in our digital era.

Without the system's evil money, we are better off. We are free to spend our wealth as we want, we are free to do business as we want, we are free from their domestic espionage, and the value of our money is determined by the market instead of decaying in value through inflation.

'Alternative money' can be any decentralized currency which competes with fiat. They can be divided into two main categories: cryptocurrencies and precious metals.

Cryptocurrency is a broad category of digital currencies. The most commonly accepted by online storefronts are Bitcoin, Ethereum, and Monero. There are now hundreds of different cryptos and tokens on the market competing for investment dollar, and they all have various pros and cons. Investors tend to be very passionate about their choices and dismissive of competitors in the industry.

Precious metals mainly divide into gold and silver. Silver bugs toting their coins as the "people's money" must contend with naysayers stacking only gold, which as a commodity has held its value against better inflation than silver has in the last 100 years. The silver bug will shoot back with his belief that silver is artificially suppressed and manipulated by the banks, and that when unleashed will raise in value to its historic price ratio of 8:1 to gold.

These arguments are lively, and the competition is a good thing. In our modern era we have forgotten what it was like for a company to actually care about our business. Those invested in cryptocurrencies and precious metals want you on their team.

The problems alternative money faces is two-fold.

1. Alternative money is currently a team sport.
2. Users treat their money as investment, not currency.

Fiat has great advantages over alternative money to the ordinary consumer. It effortlessly translates between digital spending and physical cash. The dollar is accepted everywhere and is usually your only option. For alternative money to pose any threat to fiat, these two issues must be handled.

First, alternative money should no longer be a team sport.

The competition between different flavors of cryptocurrency must be seen as a good thing. Any *decentralized* cryptocurrency is an ally against government money.

Those exclusively collecting gold or silver over the other should remember that, for the majority of human history, the market operated with a bimetallic or trimetallic system. In the US [Coinage Act of 1792](#), legal weight definitions for copper pennies, silver dollars and gold eagles were simultaneously established to serve as our nation's money.

Metal is real money. It has been used as currency in society since its inception. It can trade hands anonymously. Testing, purifying, and reshaping silver and gold is trivial with common tools and chemicals.

Metal cannot traverse the Internet. As most commerce is now online, this is a critical roadblock in getting people to adopt metal as money.

Cryptocurrencies can transact globally very quickly, sometimes instantly. Some blockchains are anonymous. There is no space requirements, and millions can be handled with just a phone. Almost all cryptos are decentralized.

Cryptocurrency cannot survive *without* the Internet, and are vulnerable to specific kinds of attacks.

Those invested in alternative money like to argue these points into very fine detail. I don't believe supremacy of one over the other is necessary. Our two camps are natural allies. There is no need to choose one over the other.

There is no way to digitize metal without trusting a central authority, such as a government. Platforms like Kinesis exist which do bridge fiat, crypto, and metals together and allow [physical redemption for a fee](#). This is an interesting idea, but as it relies on Kinesis, it is not decentralized as physical metals or cryptocurrencies are.

Conversely, there is no way to make cryptocurrency a physical item. Trinkets which purport to be worth a bitcoin are really just records of a wallet. This wallet is the same as any other wallet, requires a computer to open and verify, and can be emptied remotely without ever touching the trinket.

In a proper doomsday scenario where the Internet is splintered or electricity is scarce, digital currency networks will fail. Monero, as much as I like it, recently had a scare where a single mining pool approached 51% of all mining output. This would have given the managers of that pool total dominance over the record keeping of the Monero blockchain.

There is no way to make physical into digital, or digital into physical, without compromising it in the process. Therefore, we should accept that these two concepts are complementary solutions to the same problem: fiat money.

The Founders defined pennies, dollars, and eagles as measurements of weight for specific metals. It was up to the free market to decide their exchange rate. If we desire to circumvent fiat money and free ourselves from the government's control, we should tolerate this floating exchange rate and that currency mediums may be better suited for specific purchases.

In the same way that you would likely want to buy a house with gold instead of copper, your digital purchases would be better made with cryptocurrency instead of mailing silver coins.

Second, a critical issue with all alternative moneys is adoption.

Fiat enjoys an adoption rate of almost 100% and most people see no reason to accept anything else besides the dollar.

If you want to preserve your freedom you need to change your behaviors. I encourage you to ask landlords and servicemen who you do business with if they would accept silver or cryptocurrency. If this sounds awkward, it is. That's OK. This question will stick with them and open dialog to why you prefer not to use fiat. If the same person is asked by different people that same question, they may change their position.

A website which can accept fiat dollars can often easily be made to accept cryptocurrency. It is important that anyone doing business online makes it evident that they do accept alternative money.

I have seen cryptocurrency's adoption spread but there's still much more that can be done. Most activity you see with alternative money, particularly cryptocurrency, is speculative. People will hold, not spend, a token or coin expecting its value to go up. Why spend now if it will be worth twice as much soon? Too few people invested in crypto see their crypto as a way to actually buy something from the Internet without using a credit card. If you have crypto and see checkouts accepting crypto, you should reward those merchants for being open to alternative currencies.

Metal faces more hurdles in its adoption. It requires more education to appreciate. It also lacks crypto's draw of being a speculative emerging technology that has already made many young millionaires. With the attack on small businesses and a general decline of offline commerce, the availability of opening a new physical store at all is intimidating, never mind developing a clientele which pays with or accepts silver. Despite this, there is no harm whatsoever in making it known to your customers or business partners that you are interested in metals as a form of payment.

To rid ourselves of the system's money, we must be proactive. The more people and companies accepting alternative payments to government controlled money, the looser its grip on us and our lives.

archive.ph /vBVXu

No Loss Condition — Why YouTube, Twitter, and Facebook Own You

“#VoxAdpocalypse”, YouTube’s newest scandal, and Google’s subsequent tightening of the noose around unfriendly content, has people wondering how you kill a giant. A boycott is being suggested, but underlies the biggest issue with taking down Goliath: **YouTube does not make money. YouTube has never made money.** Google’s parent company Alphabet pays for YouTube out of pocket to control what information it puts in front of you.

In its [latest blog post](#), Google unambiguously declared it manipulates you and intends to continue manipulating you even more aggressively:

“

In addition to removing videos that violate our policies, we also want to reduce the spread of content that comes right up to the line. In [January](#), we piloted an update of our systems in the U.S. to limit recommendations of borderline content and harmful misinformation, such as videos promoting a phony miracle cure for a serious illness, or claiming the earth is flat. We’re looking to bring this updated system to more countries by the end of 2019. Thanks to this change, the number of views this type of content gets from recommendations has dropped by over 50% in the U.S. Our systems are also getting smarter about what types of videos should get this treatment, and we’ll be able to apply it to even more borderline videos moving forward. As we do this, we’ll also start raising up more authoritative content in recommendations, building on the changes we made to news last [year](#). For example, if a user is watching a video that comes close to violating our policies, our systems may include more videos from authoritative sources (like top news channels) in the “watch next” panel.

To summarize: if you watch something Alphabet does not want you to watch, it will start suggesting videos it *does* want you to watch. They go for the benign and easy example of Flat Earth Theory. If you watch a video about how the Earth is flat, it will propose you watch an 'authoritative' video on how that isn't true. YouTube will start doing this with everything it wants, in accordance to its political objectives, and it will not tell you suggestions are politically motivated when doing so.

Notice that YouTube also says it only targeted Americans with this new algorithm. That is because many foreign countries are more conservative than America, and are more religiously orthodox than America. Russia and eastern Europe in general is very unfriendly towards the LGBT. So, if Russians started noticing efforts to get them to watch pro-gay content on YouTube, it would cause outrage and encourage Yandex (Russia's Google competitor) to consider opening competing platforms, eating into YouTube's market share and loosening its grip. The goal is to tailor these suggestions and start shifting thought across nations with respect to the existing beliefs without being apparent.

Google can also tailor these suggestions based on age. With LGBT as an example specifically, many older Slavic people may be completely unwelcoming, but the younger people might not care. See "[Elsagate](#)", a 2017 YouTube scandal. At the time, nameless animation studios were pumping out hundreds of videos, and given titles that would be found by children searching for their favorite shows and characters, or things they're curious about. Some of these cheap, weird, and often disturbing videos got viewed billions of times by children. So of course, YouTube can know if a viewer is a child, and, with all these ambitions combined, YouTube can use these suggestions to influence different demographics in different countries more effectively without alarming or upsetting older people in those regions.

If Google knows who to put ads in front of to sell product, they know who to put opinions in front of to sell ideas.

Facebook is another contender for a ‘most evil company’ award — not that that is an unpopular opinion after the [Cambridge Analytica scandal](#) showed data harvested from Facebook with Facebook’s permission was already being used in U.S. elections. In his apology tours, Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg has been to Congress and the EU to stop talk of breaking up the company and assure people he’s “doing more”. He’s also asking how [Facebook can better implement world-wide censorship on ideas](#) to comply with stifling European hatespeech concepts.

I have a Facebook page I only use for helping small businesses do advertising. I use it for nothing else. However, I am continually suggested that I add my old roommate as a friend. We were never on any contracts together, I’ve never written his name online, we’ve never had each other as friends on any platform. However, when I was putting together a server in our living room, he took a picture of me with my device and put it on his Instagram to show it off. I immediately asked him to delete it, which he did, but Instagram had already recognized my face and knew that this man knew me and now suggests I reconnect with him at least once a week.

Unlike YouTube and Twitter, Facebook does make a profit with its advertising, and its advertising is very good. In my experiments with both, Facebook Ads are more precise and more worth their money than Google Ads. Facebook lets you find exactly who you want to put an ad in front of, and enables you to place it at precisely the time you want. This gives you great returns if you do it right. But, as it becomes a more and more publicly reviled enterprise, people are fleeing from the platform — onto other platforms Facebook owns, such as Instagram. Facebook Messenger and WhatsApp are also both owned by Facebook and are also in the list of top 10 most popular social media services in the world.

Most young people who prefer Instagram to Facebook don’t even know the two collate data, but they feel safer with the illusion of choice and privacy.

Twitter is not owned by large corporations, only profited off advertising [for the first time in 2018](#), and is sustained only by [angel](#)

investing. Angel investing means a network of millionaires and billionaires pour money into a money sink that its users seem to hate using because Twitter serves their own political objectives.

Twitter admits that it uses complicated mechanisms to determine what information people see. This started with the removal of the chronological timeline. Instead of seeing recent tweets first, now you see information that Twitter wants you to see in the order Twitters prefers you to see it. This is done in the name of convenience, but the practical effect is that targeted individuals do not have their most outspoken fans see their content. The most prolific sharers and likers will not see the tweets, will not engage them, and thereby hurt the targeted individual's reach. I know this is the case because I follow a huge number of people I do not see any content from unless I visit their timeline, but I do get to see every single thing Ben Shapiro has ever said as soon as he says it.

Gab.com is the main competitor to Twitter, which is painful to even say, because Gab is awful to use and is managed by an imbecile. It's also had issues with hosting, issues with cloud providers, and issues with payment processing. Twitter's main rival faces the same issue with monetization that Twitter itself has, but even if it could somehow find a way to financially exist, it would not be permitted to by Mastercard. Payment processors are not obligated to service your customers and their word is final.

Not to mention Gab suffers from what I refer to as the "8chan problem", or perhaps more succinctly, the "quarantine problem". If you make a new service just for people banned from an existing service, you will end up with only that audience. What is attractive about Gab to people not banned from Twitter? Absolutely nothing. There is no reason to go there as someone unaffected by Twitter's censorship, and furthermore, even as someone affected by Twitter's censorship, I have no reason to go there because I know people there will mostly agree with what I have to say anyways and it will gain no traction outside of that audience.

People banned from Twitter are not just set back, they are banned from the platform for life. Journalist Nick Monroe was banned last

week because Twitter discovered he had previously been banned back in 2014. Monroe's account was inoffensive and mostly just recycling information about ongoing world events. He was a very classic use case for the Twitter service and could easily be avoided if you didn't like him, but something he said must have made the owners dig up an excuse to obliterate him. Thousands of other people face the same issue, and with the President of the United States using Twitter as his primary means of communicating with the country, Twitter stands only to grow in popularity and cultural significance without those people ever being able to rejoin the conversation.

What's especially frustrating with Twitter is that it's mostly just text. YouTube is an incredibly expensive service to run, transferring and storing an inconceivable amount of audiovisual data every second. This is a point in their favor for running it how they want. Twitter, on the other hand, is mostly text. It's just ideas. There's little to worry about in terms of bandwidth, storage space, copyright theft, child pornography, gore, and the slew of other problems YouTube has to adequately deal with, which not many corporations other than Alphabet could deal with at all.

The three giants continue to dominate conversation in the country and increasingly around the world. There is little hope in curtailing them. Suggesting Washington D.C. apply a fix may result in those large companies simply moving to Europe where governments will allow them to operate as they please. Many of them already [headquarter out of Ireland](#) thanks to significant tax advantages.

The government attempting to fix things itself poses serious risks to the influences around us. Do you trust the FCC to manage your video recommendations and timelines any more than YouTube and Twitter? Do you want to give Trump / Obama / your preferred Antichrist that power?

I think about this every day. Not one day passes where I don't think about how completely fucked we are, and in that time I see a few possible fixes that might work independently or in conjunction.

Poison #1: Social Media Neutrality Reclassify *unprofitable* social media sites as a public service. These public services can be used for advertising and data collection, but cannot ban any idea, expression, or person. They cannot attempt to influence users, their views, or politics. Facebook proper is profitable so it can do what it wants, but YouTube, for instance, would either need to deal with the requirements or find a way to become profitable. For YouTube to become profitable, it would essentially need to become Netflix, and then a new and better YouTube can potentially rise from the ashes.

Poison #2: Payment Processor Neutrality I think a lot of problems might resolve themselves if the fear of losing payment processors did not exist. Right now, a huge bottleneck in alternative services is Mastercard/Visa Card. If MC/VC were required by law to process transactions no matter what, it would be far easier to conceive of profitable and fairer alternatives to what exists already. It wouldn't promise anything, but right now it's just flat-out impossible.

Poison #3: [Redacted]

With new cryptocurrency and P2P technologies, I am expecting to see successful attempts at making decentralized websites accessible to broader audiences by 2020 that deal with a lot of the issues these centralized services are creating now. There is an entire arena of new issues with that (such as state-level censorship, ISP-level censorship, domain registry censorship, etc), but it's on the horizon and I'm excited about it.

I'm very doom-and-gloom in general, but I hope 2019 will be the darkest year for the Internet. My gut tells me 2020 will be the start of something new.