

YouTube shooter did it to protest censoring / demonetizing of

YouTube channels by (((Google Cartel))) (zerohedge.com)

 Pr
ofile
pictu
re
for
user
Tyler
Durd
en

by Tyler Durden

0
SHARES

As it turns out, Tuesday's shooting at YouTube headquarters (which has so far resulted in zero deaths other than that of the shooter, who committed suicide) had nothing to do with domestic violence and everything to do with blowback to YouTube's demonetization efforts - as many initially feared.

The shooter was identified as Nasim Aghdam who slammed YouTube for purportedly censoring her after she claimed that they demonetized her channels, including an exercise one devoted to exercise videos and another devoted to veganism. Aghdam channeled her anger toward YouTube into a paranoid manifesto published online. She wrote in her purported manifesto: "Be aware! Dictatorship exists in all countries but with different tactics! **They only care for personal and short-term profits and do anything to reach their goals even by fooling simple-minded people, hiding the truth, manipulating science and everything, putting public mental and physical health at risk, abusing non-human animals, polluting the environment, destroying family values, promoting materialism and sexual degeneration in the name of freedom** and turning people into programmed robots!"

 [View image on Twitter](#)





Jack Posobiec  
@JackPosobiec

"Manifesto" posted by animal rights activist and YouTube shooter Nasim Aghdam

7:46 PM - Apr 3, 2018

 352  422 people are talking about this

She identified herself as an Iranian activist as well as an animal rights activist. Shortly after she was identified, photos of her holding signs with anti-YouTube messages were found online and shared.

 [View image on Twitter](#) 

Jack Posobiec 

@JackPosobiec



YouTube HQ shooter held a sign up decrying
"YouTube Dictatorship" in 2017

7:56 PM - Apr 3, 2018

 408  430 people are talking about this

Along with her now-deleted Instagram...

on Twitter

 [View image on Twitter](#) 

Jack Posobiec 

@JackPosobiec



Instagram pages of YouTubeHQ shooter



7:49 PM - Apr 3, 2018

 144  257 people are talking about this

...One now-deleted YouTube page bore anti-YouTube messages.

 [View image on Twitter](#)





Jack Posobiec  


@JackPosobiec

User page of YouTube shooter Nasim Aghdam - just deleted


7:42 PM - Apr 3, 2018

 398  393 people are talking about this

She recently published a video ranting about her treatment by YouTube, complaining that they'd deprived her of views. She said the practice was tantamount to censorship. She also maintained a website that [remained live](#) late Tuesday evening. It lists five channels for Aghdam. Can YouTube really both both the Jewish "Thought Police" of the Schumer-ites and a "public service"?



And driving that point home, she published a video debating whether the US or Iran did more to protect freedom of speech.



A Facebook [artist page](#) she created had more than 1,600 followers according to a cached version from archive.org. The Facebook page contains a trove of videos. They range in subject matter from lighthearted and comical to recipes for helping people eat vegan, as well as her exercise videos.

Contrary to initial reports, [ABC](#) said Aghdam wasn't in a relationship with anyone at the facility (so much for those initial suspicions).

She did not have an ID badge, and was carrying a purse. Aghdam was apparently a prolific maker of YouTube videos, maintaining several accounts for videos of different subjects.

YouTube HQ Shooting Eyewitness: I Didnt Have A Gun On Me But Wish I Did (VIDEO) (thegatewaypundit.com)

by [Joker68](#) to **news** (+209|-3)

39 comments

Rothschild Bank in Switzerland is under Criminal Investigation after David de Rothschild

Indictment (unseen-pedia.com)

submitted 13 hours ago by [rapedbyanape](#) to **news** (+107|-3)

10 comments





196

Active shooter situation at YouTube headquarters (ktvu.com)

submitted 18 hours ago by [Joker68](#) to [news](#) (+197|-1)

[211 comments](#)

Science says liberals, not conservatives, are psychotic

By [Danika Fears](#)

Audience members at a rally held by Democratic presidential candidate Senator Bernie Sanders.

Getty Images

Turns out liberals are the real authoritarians.

A political-science journal that published an oft-cited study claiming conservatives were more likely to show traits associated with “psychoticism” now says it got it wrong. Very wrong.

The American Journal of Political Science published a correction this year saying that the 2012 paper has “an error” — and that liberal political beliefs, not conservative ones, are actually linked to psychoticism.

“The interpretation of the coding of the political attitude items in the descriptive and preliminary analyses portion of the manuscript was exactly reversed,” the journal said in the startling correction.

“The descriptive analyses report that those higher in Eysenck’s psychoticism are more conservative, but they are actually more liberal; and where the original manuscript reports those higher in neuroticism and social desirability are more liberal, they are, in fact, more conservative.” In the paper, psychoticism is associated with traits such as tough-

mindedness, risk-taking, sensation-seeking, impulsivity and authoritarianism.

The social-desirability scale measures people's tendency to answer questions in ways they believe would please researchers, even if it means overestimating their positive characteristics and underestimating negative ones.

The erroneous report has been cited 45 times, according to Thomson Reuters Web of Science.

Brad Verhulst, a Virginia Commonwealth University researcher and a co-author of the paper, said he was not sure who was to blame.

"I don't know where it happened. All I know is it happened," he told Retraction Watch, a blog that tracks corrections in academic papers. "It's our fault for not figuring it out before."

The journal said the error doesn't change the main conclusions of the paper, which found that "personality traits do not cause people to develop political attitudes." But professor Steven Ludeke of the University of Southern Denmark, who pointed out the errors, told Retraction Watch that they "matter quite a lot."

"The erroneous results represented some of the larger correlations between personality and

politics ever reported; they were reported and interpreted, repeatedly, in the wrong direction," he said.

FILED UNDER CONSERVATIVES , LIBERALS ,
MENTAL HEALTH , SCIENCE