



THE SILICON VALLEY BLACKLIST

The size and scale of social media companies exploded primarily because they presented themselves as open platforms — blank slates. **Google, Facebook, and Twitter all characterized their products as engines for social improvement.** “We think of Twitter as the global town hall,” said former Twitter CEO Dick Costolo. “We are the free speech wing of the free speech party.”

Costolo was Twitter’s chief executive from 2010 until 2015 and the immediate predecessor of current CEO Jack Dorsey. Twitter’s general manager in the United Kingdom, Andy Yang, likewise described Twitter as the “free speech wing of the free speech party” in March 2012. Google became a multibillion-dollar company by offering a portal for free, unrestricted information to anyone with access to the internet; famously, its original motto was “Don’t be evil.” An internal Facebook memo circulated in June 2016 stated that at Facebook, “we believe in connecting people so deeply that anything that allows us to connect more people more often is de facto good.”

The public has given these three tech companies (and others) enormous power to select the information we read, share, and discuss with our neighbors and friends. We've gotten so accustomed to the role they play in our lives that we fail to notice that Big Tech is sifting through the available information and narrowing, and prioritizing, our choices. Although Facebook, Google, and Twitter once touted themselves as **bastions of democracy and free speech**, they are now **openly moving toward direct censorship and media manipulation** - and specifically targeting conservative ideas and personalities.

They have already acquiesced to their new censorship fetish. In March 2018, Google circulated an internal memo that instructed employees on the benefits of censorship. In the memo, which was titled "The Good Censor," **Google conceded that while the internet was "founded upon utopian principles of free speech," free speech is no longer en vogue.** "Tech companies are adapting their stance towards censorship" in direct response to "the anxiety of users and governments." The memo said that "tech firms have gradually shifted away from unmediated free speech and towards censorship and moderation" but framed that shift as a positive development. **One major way that tech companies are "stepping into the role of moderator" is by "significantly amping up the number of moderators they employ** — in YouTube's case increasing the number of people on the lookout for inappropriate content to more than 10,000." It argued that censorship was necessary partly because of users "behaving badly."

The most alarming part of the missive, however, was that it spoke approvingly of foreign governments that were censoring online speech. Google framed the acts as "taking steps to make online spaces safer, more regulated, and more similar to their offline laws. Protected from hate speech on the street? Now you are on the net too ..." Twitter has completely and publicly abandoned its brand as the "free speech wing of the free speech party," with Dorsey claiming the whole "free speech wing" thing was one giant "joke." His company, once seemingly devoted to the free expression of its users, now says it is prioritizing making users feel safe from others' speech. Facebook, too, is openly rebranding itself as a benevolent censor. Here's what Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg told the Senate Commerce and Judiciary committees in April 2018 (emphasis added):

Overall, I would say that we're going through a broader philosophical shift in how we approach our responsibility as a company. For the first 10 or 12 years of the company, I viewed our responsibility as primarily building tools that, if we could put those tools in people's hands, then that would empower people to do good things. What I think we've learned now across a number of issues, not just data privacy, but also fake news and foreign interference in elections, is that we need to take a more proactive role and a broader view of our responsibility. ***It's not enough to just build tools. We need to make sure that they're used for good. And that means that we need to now take a more active view in policing the ecosystem and in watching and kind of looking out and making sure that all of the members in our community are using these tools in a way that's going to be good and healthy.***

Three forces are driving Big Tech's online censorship.

- Two are external and related: *market pressures and de-platforming campaigns by liberal activists and journalists.*
- The third pressure is internal: *Silicon Valley is staggeringly one-sided politically.*

Profit margins and market pressures are crucial levers that left-wing ideologues use to pull tech giants and other corporations in the direction of censorship. **Companies want to avoid controversy, and, in the era of outrage mobs, that means avoiding offending the Left, which controls most of the cultural institutions in America.** That’s part of the reason why massive companies are embracing left-wing politics in advertising, such as what Gillette did with its “toxic masculinity” ad. Left-wing activists amplify those pressures with smear campaigns and boycotts intended to rattle advertisers and investors, forcing the hands of tech companies. If you convince corporate marketing agencies that advertising on Facebook is risky, you can be certain that Facebook will take some form of action to shed controversy and reassure investors.

The external pressures of left-wing activists are compounded by the internal pressures of the companies’ employees, who want Big Tech to embrace censorship against nonliberal opinions as a moral and political necessity. The internal office cultures at Facebook, Google, and Twitter have always been overwhelmingly left-leaning, but the election of Donald Trump as president has made them far more radical. I told one Silicon Valley insider that I thought tech culture now resembled the left-wing, activist culture on college campuses. He replied, **“They’re the exact same people.” Their political opinions are certainly monochromatic.** Of the \$8.1 million that tech industry workers donated to presidential candidates during the 2016 campaign, 95% of it went to Hillary Clinton. Among donations from the Silicon Valley area specifically, 99% went to Clinton.

So, maybe it’s not surprising that Google, Facebook, and Twitter have all become vehicles for left-wing activism. The companies encourage employees to bring their “authentic selves” to work. One Silicon Valley executive told me, “We want people to ... bring their entire perspective and all their values to work, and in the positive sense, that means getting rid of a huge distinction between my professional life and my personal life.” For left-wing activists in Silicon Valley, their professional, personal, and political lives are all one. That’s why Twitter launched an “intersectionality” initiative for its employees and Google gives millions to left-wing causes — to signal its allegiance to the tribe.

In 2017, the nonprofit Lincoln Network conducted a survey of tech workers in Silicon Valley, including those employed at Google, Facebook, Apple, Amazon, and Microsoft. The political leanings of those surveyed were more politically diverse than Silicon Valley’s overall population: 29% were liberal, 24% were libertarian, 22% were conservative, and 16% were centrist. But on one thing, they agreed: **75% of the liberals and 70% of the conservatives characterized their workplace as either “liberal” or “very liberal”** and fewer than 2% of the survey-takers said their places of work were conservative.

Even some of the liberal respondents thought that left-wing intolerance had gone too far. One liberal tech worker said, “I witnessed repeated calls from managers and nonmanagers alike for people to be fired for the political views they expressed.” Another liberal employee said, **“There are people who are looking for a reason to be offended, and any sort of disagreement would make them wonder if**

I'm a secret Trump supporter. The idea of 'I agree with you 90%' is not enough.” One self-identified libertarian said, “I have lost multiple talented colleagues who resigned rather than continue in the face of an increasingly extreme, narrow-minded, and regressive environment here at Google. ***It's terrifying here. A real horror show. Every day could be my last.***”

Eighty-nine percent of respondents who identified as “very conservative” said they **didn't feel comfortable expressing their opinions at work**. “It's a postmodern, secularist Silicon Valley viewpoint. Highly liberal. It's motivated by changing the world masquerading as intellectualism,” said one conservative tech employee. A libertarian said “there were many groups devoted to identity politics” in his company, and every one of them was leftist. “If you're not part of the liberal Democrat crowd, you're an outsider. Talks are often politicized, whether overtly or not. **The entire executive team leans in a certain direction, and you don't want to be the odd one out for fear of being ostracized ... Nobody who didn't fit the company's mold talked about their political views.** The company was very homogenous in that sense.” One conservative employee said, “There is overwhelming internal support for leftist political candidates, policies, and ideas, and they are frequently expressed ... There are zero to very few senior people who dare to speak up or represent an alternative (more conservative) point of view in company debates or policy decisions.”

This groupthink affects everything that Big Tech does, every decision it makes, every program it releases. As a former Google engineer noted, Google's algorithms reflect the assumptions and biases of their creators. The discussion about tech platforms and political bias often (and understandably) centers on what is or isn't *allowed* on Google, YouTube, Facebook, and Twitter, but the other half of the picture is what is and isn't *prioritized* on a platform. **Broadly speaking, tech companies censor users and content in two ways.**

- The first, which we'll call “**hard censorship,**” is pretty straightforward: deleting content or suspending users.
- The second method, which we'll call “**soft censorship,**” involves tech companies making content harder to find.

Hard censorship is tearing down a roadside billboard; soft censorship is making the billboard difficult to see by erecting other billboards in front of it. Soft censorship by tech companies can be just as effective as hard censorship. Studies show that people rarely click past the first page of Google or YouTube results. Even fewer click past the second or third page. So, pushing a link off the first page (or two or three) of Google is nearly the same as removing it from Google results altogether. The same is true with your Facebook and Twitter feeds: Companies don't have to delete content to make sure you don't see it.

Since 2016, every major tech company, including Facebook, Google, YouTube, and Twitter, has been busy retooling algorithms or news feeds or monetization standards in ways that benefit liberals and sideline conservatives. Big Tech also partners with left-wing groups such as the Southern Poverty Law Center to “flag” supposedly problematic content. The group falsely labels individual

conservatives as “extremists” and conservative organizations as “hate groups” and then promotes more restrictive content policies against alleged “hate speech.”

To give you some idea of the advocacy group’s standards, it **once accused Ben Carson of being an “extremist” for stating his belief that marriage is between a man and a woman.** Immersed in scandals of its own, the organization has been widely discredited. But it still works closely with Google engineers who design the digital tools and algorithms to police hate speech on YouTube as part of Google’s “Trusted Flaggers” program. **Google kept its collaboration with the Southern Poverty Law Center a secret, hidden behind a confidentiality agreement,** and the group only admitted the partnership after I broke the story. All of these partnerships are occurring while the advocacy group publicly keeps pressure on Facebook, Google, and Twitter, calling for them to do more to combat “hate speech” on their platforms, which invariably means giving the organization more power in its private dealings with the companies. The Southern Poverty Law Center led five other left-wing groups in forming a coalition called “Change the Terms” that aims to pressure all major technology service providers into setting speech codes governing what their clients say both on and off their platforms.

The coalition demands that each company agree to implement a specific set of policies already drafted by the activists. Among the required changes: empowering third-party organizations (such as, say, the Southern Poverty Law Center) to flag “hateful” actors. The activists’ targets aren’t limited to Facebook, Google, and Twitter (although those companies are certainly on the list) but also include credit card companies and crowdfunding sites. **Once a company caves to the pressure and agrees to adopt the left-wing contract, it has essentially deputized the coalition to decide who can stay on its platform or use its services and who must leave.** Once the contract is official, the activists immediately shift gears to identify the users or customers the company is now required to ban from its platform. Left-wingers’ plan for weaponizing tech platforms bears a resemblance to the “social credit score” system adopted by the Chinese government. Only instead of the government monitoring your private behavior and limiting your access to society as a result, it’s a collective of left-wing advocacy groups partnered with multinational corporations.

First Amendment rights do not protect you from private organizations’ limitations on speech. It’s a devious strategy, and it’s working. Media Matters is a left-wing political group devoted to silencing conservative viewpoints in the media. For much of its history, it focused on attacking Fox News, but in recent years, it targeted conservative voices online as well. Media Matters presented a 44-page memo to liberal donors at a January 2017 summit that bragged about its plans to work with Facebook and Google to destroy nonliberal media outlets. The memo argued that enlisting Big Tech in the left-wing campaign to eliminate conservative media is essential if liberals hope to defeat Trump in 2020. Media Matters promised to accomplish exactly that. **“Key right-wing targets will see their influence diminished as a result of our work,”** it promised.

Leftists don’t need to banish every conservative from social media; they only need to dominate social media the way they dominate the mainstream media. They’re OK with discussion that takes place within boundaries they set (as on MSNBC) and so long as they win the elections that matter to them (such as the White House). Since Nov. 8, 2016, they have shifted the digital landscape against

conservative voices. *By Nov. 3, 2020, they will have transformed (or rigged) social media in ways that will have far-reaching implications for America.*

How Dianne Feinstein Can Make Sure You Can Never Get A Job Again If You Speak Against Her

- Nancy Pelosi, Barbara Boxer, Ed Lee, Gavin Newsom and other politicians can access your voting records, every HR service and the hiring managers at every Bay Area company from their desktop computers.
- Black-listing of hated employees is a big thing in the Bay Area.
- The FBI has not yet been ordered by DOJ to halt this.
- Corrupt politicians can kill your career with one phone call or mouse click.

The High-Tech Employee Antitrust Litigation is a 2010 [United States Department of Justice](#) (DOJ) [antitrust](#) action and a 2013 civil [class action](#) against several [Silicon Valley](#) companies for alleged "no [cold call](#)" agreements which restrained the recruitment of high-tech employees. It proved that the main financiers of Nancy Pelosi, Barbara Boxer, Ed Lee, Gavin Newsom, Dianne Feinstein and other Bay Area political manipulators, can easily keep you from ever working again if you piss them off.

The defendants are [Adobe](#), [Apple Inc.](#), [Google](#), [Intel](#), [Intuit](#), [Pixar](#), [Lucasfilm](#) and [eBay](#), all high-technology companies with a principal place of business in the San Francisco–Silicon Valley area of California.

The civil class action was filed by five plaintiffs, one of whom has died in a possible hush-up-murder; it accused the tech companies of collusion between 2005 and 2009 to refrain from recruiting each other's employees.

Cold calling is one of the main methods used by companies in the high-technology sector to recruit employees with advanced and specialised skills, such as software and hardware engineers, programmers, animators, digital artists, Web developers and other technical professionals.^[1] Cold calling involves communicating directly in any manner with another firm's employee who has not otherwise applied for a job opening. Cold calling may be done in person, by phone, letter, or email.^[2] According to the legal brief filed by a plaintiff in one of the class-action cases, cold calling is an effective method of recruiting for the high-technology sector because "employees of other [high-technology] companies are often unresponsive to other recruiting strategies... [and] current satisfied employees tend to be more qualified, harder working, and more stable than those who are actively looking for employment."^[3]

Amy Lambert, Google's associate general counsel, noted in a blog post shortly after the DOJ's actions, that Google's definition of cold calling does not necessarily eliminate recruiting by letter or email, but only the process of calling on the telephone. By implication, recruiting through LinkedIn incurs

recruiting by "InMail" - LinkedIn's own mail contact system:"In order to maintain a good working relationship with these companies, in 2005 we decided not to "cold call" employees at a few of our partner companies. Our policy only impacted cold calling, and we continued to recruit from these companies through LinkedIn, job fairs, employee referrals, or when candidates approached Google directly. In fact, we hired hundreds of employees from the companies involved during this time period."

The challenged "no cold call" agreements are alleged bilateral agreements between high technology companies not to cold call each other's employees. The DOJ alleges that senior executives at each company negotiated to have their employees added to 'no call' lists maintained by human resources personnel or in company hiring manuals. The alleged agreements were not limited by geography, job function, product group, or time period. The alleged bilateral agreements were between: (1) Apple and Google, (2) Apple and Adobe, (3) Apple and Pixar, (4) Google and Intel, (5) Google and Intuit,^[4] and (6) Lucasfilm and Pixar.^[5]

The civil class action further alleges that agreements also existed to (1) "provide notification when making an offer to another [company]'s employee (without the knowledge or consent of the employee)" and (2) "agreements that, when offering a position to another company's employee, neither company would counteroffer above the initial offer."^[3]

Department of Justice antitrust action

On September 24, 2010, the [United States Department of Justice Antitrust Division](#) filed a complaint in the [US District Court for the District of Columbia](#) alleging violations of Section 1 of the [Sherman Act](#). In *US v. Adobe Systems Inc., et al.*, the Department of Justice alleged that Adobe, Apple, Google, Intel, Intuit, and Pixar had violated Section 1 of the Sherman Act by entering into a series of bilateral "No Cold Call" Agreements to prevent the recruitment of their employees (a similar but separate suit was filed against Lucasfilm on December 21, 2010^[6]). The DOJ alleged in their Complaint that the companies had reached "facially anticompetitive" agreements that "eliminated a significant form of competition...to the detriment of the affected employees who were likely deprived of competitively important information and access to better job opportunities." The DOJ also alleged that the agreements "were not ancillary to any legitimate collaboration," "were much broader than reasonably necessary for the formation or implementation of any collaborative effort," and "disrupted the normal price-setting mechanisms that apply in the labor setting."^[4] The same day it filed the suit, the DOJ and the defendants proposed a settlement.^[7]

A final judgment enforcing the settlement was entered by the court on March 17, 2011.^[8] Although the DOJ Complaint only challenged the alleged "no cold call" agreements, in the settlement, the companies agreed to a more broad prohibition against "attempting to enter into, entering into, maintaining or enforcing any agreement with any other person to in any way refrain from, requesting that any person in any way refrain from, or pressuring any person in any way to refrain from soliciting, cold calling, recruiting, or otherwise competing for employees of the other person", for a period of five years; the

court can grant an extension.[8] The settlement agreement does not provide any compensation for company employees affected by the alleged agreements.[9] Lucasfilm entered into a similar settlement agreement in December 2010.[5]

Civil class action

In re: High-Tech Employee Antitrust Litigation ([U.S. District Court, Northern District of California 11-cv-2509 \[10\]](#)) is a [class-action](#) lawsuit on behalf of over 64,000 employees of [Adobe](#), [Apple Inc.](#), [Google](#), [Intel](#), [Intuit](#), [Pixar](#) and [Lucasfilm](#) (the last two are subsidiaries of [Disney](#)) against their employer alleging that their wages were repressed due to alleged agreements between their employers not to hire employees from their competitors.[11][12] The case was filed on May 4, 2011 by a former software engineer at Lucasfilm and alleges violations of California's antitrust statute, Business and Professions Code sections 16720 et seq. (the "Cartwright Act"); Business and Professions Code section 16600; and California's unfair competition law, Business and Professions Code sections 17200, et seq. Focusing on the network of connections around former Apple CEO [Steve Jobs](#), the Complaint alleges "an interconnected web of express agreements, each with the active involvement and participation of a company under the control of Steve Jobs...and/or a company that shared at least one member of [Apple's board of directors](#)." The alleged intent of this conspiracy was "to reduce employee compensation and mobility through eliminating competition for skilled labor." [13]

On October 24, 2013 the [United States District Court for the Northern District of California](#) granted class certification for all employees of Defendant companies from January 1, 2005 through January 1, 2010.[9]

As of October 31, 2013, Intuit, Pixar and Lucasfilm have reached a tentative settlement agreement. Pixar and Lucasfilm agreed to pay \$9 million in damages, and Intuit agreed to pay \$11 million in damages.[9] In May 2014, Judge [Lucy Koh](#) approved the \$20 million settlement between Lucasfilm, Pixar, and Intuit and their employees. Class members in this settlement, which involved fewer than 8% of the 65,000 employees affected, will receive around \$3,840 each.[14]

The trial of the class action for the remaining Defendant companies was scheduled to begin on May 27, 2014. The plaintiffs intended to ask the jury for \$3 billion in compensation, a number which could in turn have tripled to \$9 billion under antitrust law.[15] However, in late April 2014, the four remaining defendants, [Apple Inc](#), [Google](#), [Intel](#) and [Adobe Systems](#), agreed to settle out of court. Any settlement must be approved by Judge [Lucy Koh](#). [16][17]

On May 23, 2014, Apple, Google, Intel, Adobe agreed to settle for \$324.5 million. Lawyers sought 25% in attorneys' fees, plus expenses of as much as \$1.2 million, according to the filing. Additional award payments of \$80,000 would be sought for each named plaintiff who served as a class representative.[18] Payouts will average a few thousand dollars based on the salary of the employee at the time of the complaint.

In June 2014, Judge Lucy Koh expressed concern that the settlement may not be a good one for the plaintiffs. Michael Devine, one of the plaintiffs, said the settlement is unjust. In a letter he wrote to the

judge he said the settlement represents only one-tenth of the \$3 billion in compensation the 64,000 workers could have made if the defendants had not colluded.[\[19\]](#)

On August 8, 2014, Judge Koh rejected the settlement as insufficient on the basis of the evidence and exposure. Rejecting a settlement is unusual in such cases. This left the defendants with a choice between raising their settlement offer or facing a trial.[\[20\]](#)

On September 8, 2014, Judge Koh set April 9, 2015 as the actual trial date for the remaining defendants, with a pre-trial conference scheduled for December 19, 2014. Also, as of early September 2014, the defendants had re-entered mediation to determine whether a new settlement could be reached.[\[21\]](#)

A final approval hearing was held on July 9, 2015.[\[22\]](#) On Wednesday September 2, 2015, Judge Lucy H. Koh signed an order granting Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement. The settlement website stated that Adobe, Apple, Google, and Intel has reached a settlement of \$415 million and other companies settled for \$20 million.

According to the settlement website, Gilardi & Co., LLC distributed the settlement to class members the week of December 21, 2015.

While working at Google, Schmidt was involved in activities[\[47\]](#) that later became the subject of the [High-Tech Employee Antitrust Litigation](#) case that resulted in a settlement of \$415 million paid by [Adobe](#), [Apple](#), Google and [Intel](#) to employees. In one incident, after receiving a complaint from [Steve Jobs](#) of Apple, Schmidt sent an email to Google's HR department saying; "I believe we have a policy of no recruiting from Apple and this is a direct inbound request. Can you get this stopped and let me know why this is happening? I will need to send a response back to Apple quickly so please let me know as soon as you can. Thanks Eric".[\[48\]](#) Schmidt's email led to a recruiter for Google being "terminated within the hour" for not having adhered to the illegal scheme. Under Schmidt, there was a "Do Not Call list" of companies Google would avoid recruiting from.[\[49\]](#) According to a court filing, another email exchange shows Google's human resources director asking Schmidt about sharing its no-cold-call agreements with competitors. Schmidt responded that he preferred it be shared "verbally, since I don't want to create a paper trail over which we can be sued later?"[\[47\]](#)[\[50\]](#) On August 28, 2006, Schmidt was elected to [Apple Inc.](#)'s board of directors, a position he held until August 2009.[\[11\]](#)[\[51\]](#)

Former [Google](#) employee [James Damore](#) filed a class action lawsuit Monday against the tech giant, alleging discrimination against conservative and white male employees.

The former software engineer worked for [Google](#) from 2013 until August when his employment was terminated.

He was fired after he drafted and circulated an internal memo concerning politics, diversity and gender, which went viral, sparking colleagues to send [Mr. Damore](#) threats. According to the legal complaint, [Mr. Damore](#) drafted the memo in response to diversity workshops in an attempt to create debate about the company's political correctness and hiring practices.

“[Google](#) employees who expressed views deviating from the majority view at [Google](#) on political subjects raised in the workplace and relevant to [Google](#)’s employment policies and its business, such as ‘diversity’ hiring policies, ‘bias sensitivity,’ or ‘social justice,’ were/are singled out, mistreated, and systematically punished and terminated from [Google](#), in violation of their legal rights,” read [Mr. Damore](#)’s complaint filed at the Superior Court of California in Santa Clara.

[Mr. Damore](#) is joined by another former [Google](#) employee as plaintiffs in the action, and they seek to represent all [Google](#) employees who have been discriminated against due to their gender, race or political views. According to the complaint, [Mr. Damore](#) spoke to Meghana Rao, who worked for [Google](#)’s human resources department, about conservatives feeling disenfranchised at the company. Ms. Rao reportedly said she had heard similar complaints from other employees.

He alleges the company blacklisted conservatives and threatened them with termination.

His lawsuit proves high-tech blacklisting and asks the court to issue both monetary and injunctive relief.

When Dianne Feinstein's Chief of Staff isn't contracting Fusion GPS or Black Cube to attack citizens, he has a rolodex of names at tech companies he can call to get you black-listed. Even worse, he has a list of IT staff he can call. These, mostly East Indian, IT contacts work at **BambooHR, Zoho People, Axiom, Gusto, Oracle, Taleo, Trakstar, Freshteam, ClearCompany, Workday, ADP Workforce Now, UltiPro, Dayforce HCM, Kronos Workforce Central, iCIMS, CivicHr, PurelyHR Time-Off, 7Geese, Collage, Perdo, Qandle, Splunk, Zimyo HRMS, Xobin Interact, Palantir** and other firms you may not even know existed.

With just a few keystrokes, John Doe is "red flagged", "black-listed", "negged", "shadow-banned" and removed from the job pool. Covert codes and meta-tags are inserted into the databases so that John Doe will never get a second interview. John will never be able to see this hidden codes that will end his life. All of these companies have the ability to cross-examine each other's databases. Of course, the NSA looks at all of that data.

This reprisal vendetta process was said have been created by Black Cube in order to help Obama covertly attack his enemies.


Even if John Doe has the finest work experience, the most impressive letters of reference, incredible work accomplishments and a resume to-die-for... he is now dead in the career market because he pissed off a corrupt Senator!

[Fired Silicon Valley engineer sounds the alarm on Big Tech's ...](#)

<https://freedomoutpost.com/fired-silicon-valley-engineer-sounds-the-alarm-on-big-techs-conservative-blacklisting/>

The logic is sound: If Russia could use the internet to meddle in our democracy, so could Google, Facebook, Twitter, and others. And, unlike Russia, it wouldn't take a high-level hacking team battling **Silicon Valley** cybersecurity experts to do so.

[The Silicon Valley blacklist - TechCrunch](#)

 <https://techcrunch.com/2017/07/02/silicon-valley-blacklist/>

The **Silicon Valley** blacklist. Megan Rose Dickey @meganrosedickey / 3 years What a year (life?) it's been for white women, people of color and nonbinary people in tech.

[Robert Spencer: Silicon Valley Blacklisting ...](#)

 <https://www.breitbart.com/tech/2018/08/17/robert-spencer-silicon-valley-blacklisting-conservatives-with-no-recourse-no-appeal-no-discussion/>

Media Politics Tech Alex Jones Gavin McInnes jihad Jihad Watch political censorship Robert Spencer **Silicon Valley** Southern Poverty Law Center. Please let us know if you're having issues with commenting.

[The rise of financial blacklisting | Spectator USA](#)

 <https://spectator.us/financial-blacklisting-sargon-akkad/>


Benjamin's defenestration needs to be understood in the context of a much wider ongoing purge of right wing voices by **Silicon Valley**, which now likes to see itself as the world's liberal bulwark against the dark, populist forces supposedly unleashed by Donald Trump. Superficially, this might sound reasonable.

[Silicon Valley \(season 6\) - Wikipedia](#)

 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Silicon_Valley_\(season_6\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Silicon_Valley_(season_6))

The site's critical consensus reads, "Though the strangeness of reality threatens to one-up it, **Silicon Valley** 's final season is funny, fearless, and still playing by its own rules to the very end." On Metacritic, the season has a score of 78 out of 100 based on 4 reviews. References

[This influential Silicon Valley firm is spearheading a ...](#)

 https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/economy/this-influential-silicon-valley-firm-is-compiling-a-blacklist-of-venture-capitalists-who-harass-women/2017/07/14/1dfc7164-6661-11e7-8eb5-cbccc2e7bfbf_story.html

This influential **Silicon Valley** firm is spearheading a blacklist of venture capitalists accused of harassing women ... that four out of the five top venture capital firms in **Silicon Valley** lack a ...

[Kamala Vs. Laura: IT'S ON! - CORRUPTION 123: THE TV SERIES](#)

 <https://www.videonet111.com/video/kamala-vs-laura-it-s-on->

California Sen. Kamala Harris pushes to end private health insurance, faces blowback on 'Medicare for All' platform. #IngrahamAngle #FoxNewsFOX News Channel (FNC) is a 24-hour all-encompassing

news service dedicated to delivering breaking news as well as political and business news. The number one network in cable, FNC has been the most watched television news channel for more than 16 years ...

[Corrupt California - The California Tech Mafia - OUR REPORT ...](#)

<https://nationalnewsnetwork.net/video/corrupt-california-the-california-tech-mafia>

Why are these **Silicon Valley** Oligarchs and their K-Street law firms and lobbyists immune from the law? U.S. Senators, Agency Heads and Congress are bribed with:- Billions of dollars of Google, Twitter, Facebook, Tesla, Netflix and Sony Pictures stock and stock warrants which is never reported to the FEC- Billions of dollars of Google, Twitter ...

[Google Is a Nancy Pelosi Front Operation - Our Report to Congress](#)

<https://nationalnewsnetwork.net/video/google-is-unfair>

Through the **Silicon Valley** control of the facade group: "The National Venture Capital Association", DOE ensured that NO car company or solar company in America could get funded, by any private means, without **Silicon Valley** oligarch approval. The DOE is a corrupt organization operated by corrupt insiders for corrupt purposes!

[Almost every social media company got put out of business and ...](#)

<https://losangelestribunenews.wordpress.com/2016/12/10/almost-every-social-media-company-got-put-out-of-business-and-only-a-select-few-were-allowed-to-survive-but-why/>


Almost every social media company got put out of business and only a select few were allowed to survive. But why? Wikimedia Draft 2.1 It looks suspicious.

[Operations Center Sent: Saturday, March 2, 2019 9:33 PM ...](#)

https://www.uspto.gov/sites/default/files/documents/eligibility2019comments_f_operations_2019mar02.pdf

- Inside The **Silicon Valley** Cartel. In **Silicon Valley** there is a Cartel of "Venture Capitalists" who like to call entrepreneurs in, examine their technologies in 'fishing expeditions', say "we can't see any use for it", copy the technology and launch it themselves; after **black-listing** the entrepreneur. That is their "playbook."

[Breitbart's Coroner Murdered - - Knew Too Much About Obama ...](#)

 <https://www.videonet111.com/cat/e3-how-the-oligarchs-attack-you/video/breitbart-s-coroner-murdered-knew-too-much-about-obama-cleantech-crash?catName=e3-how-the-oligarchs-attack-you>
In **Silicon Valley** there is a Cartel of "Venture Capitalists" who like to call entrepreneurs in, examine their technologies in 'fishing expeditions', say "we can't see any use for it", copy the technology and launch it themselves; after **black-listing** the entrepreneur. That is their "playbook."

[Reading: Softbank Vision Fund 2 - The Rock Island News](#)

 <https://therockislandnews.com/reading-softbank-vision-fund-2/>

Silicon Valley Black Listing . IPO Recap Q2 2017 . Venture Capital Financing Q2 2017 . Think about Cup 2017 . IPO tube in August . Indian Accelerator Ecosystem . Massive Knowledge Prime 25 . US Cellular Apps 2017 . Cool Distributors 2017 . Prime Safety Applied sciences 2017 . Disturb SF Hackathon . Startup Battlefield 2017 . CNBC Disruptor 50 ...

[Blacklisting Chick-fil-A | Misrule of Law](#)

 <https://misruleoflaw.com/2019/03/26/blacklisting-chick-fil-a/>

Mar 26, 2019The city's **black-listing** of Chick-fil-A seeks to punish the company (and its owners) for espousing mainstream beliefs shared by most Americans—and, ironically, an overwhelming majority of San Antonio's residents, many of whom are Catholics. (San Antonio, one of the oldest Spanish settlements in Texas, was named after Saint Anthony of Padua.)

[BuzzTy | buzzty.co](#)

 <https://www.buzzty.co>

James Woods Banned From Twitter Amid **Silicon Valley's** Conservative **Black Listing** Campaign. by BuzzTy May 4, 2019, 5:17 pm. 10 Shares. in NEWS.

[Here's Why Indian Students Were Deported from Blacklisted ...](#)

 <https://www.happyschools.com/indian-students-deported-blacklisted-universities-usa/>

What a drama about Air India denying 19 Indian students traveling to the USA to attend SVU and NPU, since Air India thinks they are blacklisted universities in USA. I wanted to provide clarity and get to the bottom of this news. I'm publishing the scanned copies of withdrawal of application (I-275) or denied entry form (I-867A) issued to students with names and other personally identifying ...

[Rolling Stones' team blasts Santa Clara for 'restrictive and ...](#)

 <https://www.santacruzsentinel.com/2019/09/11/rolling-stones-team-blasts-santa-clara-for-restrictive-and-dysfunctional-rules-at-levis/>

Sep 11, 2019 Although city spokeswoman Lenka Wright told **Silicon Valley** Voice on Aug. 20 that Santana authorized an extension of the curfew by one hour, Santana said Wednesday there was no formal deal to do so ...

[Urban Dictionary: silicon mafia](#)

[https://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=silicon mafia](https://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=silicon%20mafia)

Companies in **Silicon Valley** that violate civil law and international treaties to rip off their customers. ... **black-listing** a VPN or biasing a news-feed with ...

[Rolling Stones' team blast Santa Clara after Levi's concert](#)

 <https://www.mercurynews.com/2019/09/11/rolling-stones-team-blasts-santa-clara-for-restrictive-and-dysfunctional-rules-at-levis/>

Although city spokeswoman Lenka Wright told **Silicon Valley** Voice on Aug. 20 that Santana authorized an extension of the curfew by one hour, Santana said Wednesday there was no formal deal to do so ...

[FORENSICS AND PUBLIC ADVOCACY GROUP - Research Director ...](#)

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/forensics-and-public-advocacy-group-922b1b176>

- Venture Capital **Black-Listing** By Government Officials And Their **Silicon Valley** Oligarch Sponsors
- Work **Black-Listing** By Government Officials And Their **Silicon Valley** Oligarch Sponsors

[Host of problems | Reveal](#)

<https://www.revealnews.org/episodes/host-of-problems/>

Nov 5, 2016 Judge backs Reveal's suit to end secrecy around **Silicon Valley's** diversity ... Host of problems. ... should consider **black listing** families who violate the terms ...

[Gat Mafia Ruined The DNC - Europe Today News](#)

<https://europetodaynews.wordpress.com/2017/05/05/gat-mafia-ruined-the-dnc/>

May 5, 2017 **Silicon Valley**: The Empire Of The C*ck-Holsters; How the Gay Mafia Tried To Take Over the DNC! It's not that anybody cares about what they do in the bedroom, it is that they are close-minded, **black-listing**, reverse-misogynist pricks who treat everybody else terribly. The biggest venture capitalists and the heads of Google and Facebook...

[White House Wants To Only Use Tech Workers From Google and ...](#)

<https://yro.slashdot.org/story/18/10/23/045243/white-house-wants-to-borrow-tech-workers-from-google-and-amazon-says-report>

Attracting tech talent may prove difficult for the Trump administration, which hasn't always seen eye to eye with **Silicon Valley** on issues such as the president's ban on travel from predominantly Muslim countries. However, White House officials believe tech workers are willing to "put politics aside."