

GAWKER MEDIA STAFF HAVE “LIFE-LONG INVESTIGATIONS” ON THEM FOR THEIR ATTACKS AND CORRUPTION!

Gawker, Google, Univision, Valleywag, Jalopnik, Gizmodo, etc. are all the same people running the same life-long character assassination programs against political "enemies". Payback is a bitch, though...

While Hulk Hogan walked away with a jury award of \$140M+, and others walked away with nearly a million in damages payments, many of those most damaged by Gawker's attacks have not seen a dime in compensation. Gawker's DNC-biased New York bankruptcy court was helping Gawker skip out of obligations.

Now, Peter Thiel and 20 Other Gawker Victims To Bring IRS Investigations Against Nick Denton and His Staff "Forever!"

Hulk Hogan was 'humanized' by Gawker lawsuit

- [By Celebretainment](#)
-

Hulk Hogan felt "humanized" after winning his invasion of privacy lawsuit against Gawker in 2016, according to his daughter Brooke Hogan.

The 63-year-old wrestling legend was awarded \$115 million in March 2016 after he successfully sued Gawker Media for defamation, loss of privacy, and emotional pain for the company's decision in 2012 to post a clip online of a secretly recorded sex tape featuring Hulk and Heather Clem, the ex-wife of his former pal radio personality Bubba the Love Sponge.

During the legal process, Hulk's reputation was damaged when a transcript of audio from the tape was released featuring him using the 'N-word' whilst discussing a now-former boyfriend of Brooke's and he was released from his contract with WWE.

The 'Rocky III' held himself accountable for using the inappropriate language and made a public apology for saying that word back in 2007 when the tape was made, a period in Hulk's life when he had been suffering from depression in the wake of his wife Linda Hogan filing for divorce and had contemplated suicide.

Brooke, 28, admits the ordeal was very tough on her father but the case allowed the public to learn more about the situation her dad was in.

She shared: "It was very tough on him. It was very sad to see him so screwed up because I know none of us are perfect."

In the midst of the legal case, the blonde beauty reassured her father that he had earned the trust of his loyal fans after years in the spotlight, and the sex tape was not going to permanently taint his reputation.

Brooke told The Hollywood Reporter: "I said, 'Dad, no matter how crazy the press is, the public and your fans, they're not stupid. They know your heart and who you are.' "

And while Brooke has refused to specifically discuss her father's ultimate settlement with Gawker - which is rumoured to be worth \$31 million - she insisted he "persevered, and always took the high road and was accountable, and I respect and honour him for that".

More recently, Hulk - whose real name is Terry Bollea - has turned his attention towards Brooke's burgeoning TV career, which has seen her become the host of the reality TV series 'The Fashion Hero'.

The Canadian produced series is currently being shopped to international buyers and the wrestling legend has even asked to be a contestant on her show.

Brooke revealed: "I said, 'Dad, you can't model,' even though he could as he models his own T-shirts. But that's enough."

But Brooke admitted her father's positive outlook has been a huge help to her throughout her life - especially during her difficult teenage years.

She explained: "I'm Italian. Most of my family is severely over-weight. It's been taxing to keep my weight under control. I also had really bad skin and I wasn't popular.

"He [Hulk] was always a horse of a different colour. He was tanned and blond and from Venice Beach. And people assumed he was a big, loud, screaming monster. But the cool thing is he used his platform for good. He knew he was impacting impressionable minds. So he told young kids to train, say your prayers and eat your vitamins."

- NICK DENTON IS THE HIRED CHARACTER ASSASSIN FOR BARACK OBAMA AND HILLARY CLINTON.
-
- THE IRS IS DEEPLY INVESTIGATING GAWKER MEDIA, UNIVISION, NICK DENTON AND HIS STAFF BASED ON TIPS FROM THE STAFF THAT WORKED WITH NICK DENTON'S GABRIELLE DARBYSHIRE
-
- YOU KILLED US, BUT WE WILL KILL YOU BACK SAY OTHER GAWKER VICTIMS

Proving That Gawker's Partner: Google, Does Operate Contracts and "Hit-Jobs", Google De-List's InfoWars from Its Search Index in Reprisal Move

InfoWars articles must be rated "Low to Medium."

Mike Cernovich | Medium.com - April 17, 2017 [Comments](#)



Image Credits : [Niharb / Flickr.](#) Go

Google has hired contractors to remove or limit Alex Jones' website Infowars.com from its search engines. According to a search engine evaluator for Google, all contractors have been instructed to actively rate InfoWars as a low quality and untrusted site.

This email was sent out to all contractors.

It's useful to then explore what a rather poor site may look like and how to analyze the landing page it presents. And so, we look today to Info Wars.



Things to note...

- This is a news article from *Infowars*. In considering the quality of any article, you should be mindful of where that article comes from. What reputation does it have, and how might that reputation affect its day-to-day coverage?
- To be clear, the page isn't an outright false story like some of the more infamous websites, so we're not going to consider it among the worst of the worst in that regard.

The instructions to the contractors provide:

- InfoWars is not an “outright false” website and is not “among the worst of the worst.”
- “There are a number of controversial, often debunked claims that the site regularly promotes.”
- InfoWars articles must be rated “Low to Medium.”

— — —

Mike Cernovich is a journalist, author, and filmmaker.

<https://youtu.be/iE4CpY3vO14>

<https://youtu.be/L-6Y-79C-LM>

- To be clear, the page isn't an outright false story like some of the more infamous websites, so we're not going to consider it among the worst of the worst in that regard.

Infowars is a site run by Alex Jones, whom you can [read all about here](#). There are a number of controversial, often debunked claims that the site regularly promotes. How should we handle this when rating for PQ?

Acceptable Range ([click for image](#) or highlight to reveal): **Low to Medium**

Feedback:

Given the poor reputation and conspiratorial bent of the website, a lower rating is more appropriate. Users have a reasonable expectation that news websites they visit report verifiable facts and Infowars.com teeters fairly recklessly into sensationalist territory at the expense of expertise and reporting with the accountability of a professional news organization.

The Guidelines have [this to say](#) on the subject of reputation:

Important: Negative reputation is sufficient reason to give a page a **Low** quality rating. Evidence of truly malicious or fraudulent behavior warrants the **Lowest** rating.

Is there evidence of fraud, or malicious behavior? Even if the article represents a certain slant from a conspiracy-laden website, it would be hard to make that case. Simply presenting an unorthodox perspective on the news doesn't exactly qualify, even if it may be "harmful" in the larger, more elliptical sense of the term. You could say that we're being generous with the upper range here, but the site may be considered useful to some users looking for an alternative source of information redeems it in some small way.

Remember...

When looking for the quality of pages, you'll want to consider the reputation of an article and its penchant for sensationalism or unverified claims, if relevant.

Bonus Example: What about [this news article](#), which covers the same subject? We'd give it a rating of High to High+. While CNN isn't a perfect news outlet, it is a popular news source that covers the story with a depth and mostly straightforward reporting. There are clips of the interview with Assad and quotes from experts that help provide context that would be helpful to any user. To compare, the *Infowars* article is brief and only mentions statements from sources not really typical: Putin, former Congressman Ron Paul, and Assad himself, which seem to be making the same case here that bolsters the site's previously held perspectives, which cut against the grain, to say the least.

Remember that all news organizations that have existed long enough have courted their share of controversy and mistakes. What we're asking you to do here is to ensure that the line between reliability and outright negligence of facts is honored when you apply your best rating judgement.

<https://youtu.be/q3y3qRKeaTA>

<https://youtu.be/dlhNanR4pCA>

Related Articles

[**GREENFIELD: Free Speech Dies In Berkeley.**](#)