Twitter Thread by Curse

Curse
@cursedsalad

1. A popular "Conservative" pundit is working with an Israelis to censor Americans while claiming to be a champion of free speech. He was the first to retweet their call to ban my account, and also among their first followers.

Let's talk about the Jewish war on free speech.

2. Before we begin, it is necessary to point out that earlier last month this "Conservative" reported about the "threat" of social media censorship. Yet, three weeks later, he participated in a Jewish campaign to censor a fellow American.

3. In adopting this role of Anti-Semitism Policeman, he has betrayed the foundational American principle of free speech and given credence to the claim that "hate speech is not free speech." Has he forgotten the importance of free speech? Perhaps a refresher is in order...

4. “If there is any principle of the Constitution that more imperatively calls for attachment than any other, it is the principle of free thought, not free thought for those who agree with us, but freedom for the thought that we hate.”
- Justice Oliver Wendell

5. “Censorship reflects a society’s lack of confidence in itself. It is a hallmark of an authoritarian regime.”
- Justice Potter Stewart

6. “Restriction of free thought and free speech is the most dangerous of all subversions.”
- Justice William Douglass

7. "Speech that demeans on the basis of race, ethnicity, gender, religion, age, disability, or any other similar ground is hateful, but the proudest boast of our free speech jurisprudence is that we protect the freedom to express the thought that we hate."
- Justice Samuel Alito

8. "We should celebrate, rather than condemn, the addition of hate speech to the public debate."
- Justice Antonin Scalia

9. "A law that can be directed against speech found offensive to some portion of the public can be turned against minority and dissenting views to the detriment of all. Our reliance must be on the substantial safeguards of free and open discussion."
- Justice Anthony Kennedy

10. "If freedom of speech is taken away, then dumb and silent we may be led, like sheep, to the slaughter."
- George Washington

11. According to the Founders, free speech - which includes hate speech - is not only a legal right, but an inalienable, God-given natural right, and is innately part of being human.

But like Karl Marx, the "Conservative" who attempted to ban me disagrees with the Founders.

12. This "Conservative's" position on censorship is identical to those he condemns. He condemned Twitter for banning Jew Laura Loomer after she criticized Muslims, yet invites Twitter to ban people who criticize Jews. We're reaching levels of hypocrisy that shouldn't be possible.

13. So what is Twitter's position on censorship? Twitter has carved out a vaguely-defined category of speech called "hate speech" & deemed it a "threat to democracy." This is in direct conflict with Justice Kennedy's opinion who says ALL speech must be safeguarded in a democracy.

14. Incidentally, Justice Kennedy says the power to regulate speech must not be entrusted to the government, yet by virtue of using the internet, we entrust this power to the ADL - a Jewish advocacy group that was indicted for spying on Americans for Israel. But I digress.

15. As we know, this problem isn't isolated to Twitter. Many private companies have taken it upon themselves to police our morality. But it's not porn or pedophilia they're policing - it's hate speech; a non-legal term whose definition is as vague as it is unconstitutional.

16. What we're witnessing is a fracturing of America: the private & public spheres are fundamentally divided in regard to American rights. The private sphere, unbeholden to the Constitution, penalizes Americans for exercising their inalienable right to express offensive thoughts.

17. This duality materialized when public speech migrated from public spaces like college campuses to private spaces like Twitter, but speech protections didn't migrate with it. Alas, even in public spaces, the inalienable right of free speech is now being penalized ■

18. The private sphere is now operating by completely different principles than what the Founders mandated for the public sphere, and for the first time in the country's history, it's made Americans afraid to speak their mind.

But rest assured, Trump is monitoring the situation.

19. So, a consortium of private tech firms who host the majority of all American speech on their platforms have decried free speech as harmful to democracy despite the fact that of the 210 million Americans who use social media, a majority support

free speech even if it's hateful

20. When the opinion of the majority is disregarded in favor of the opinion of the minority, it means the minority has disproportionate power. Who is this minority? Jews.

Just more proof that democracy is dead & we are living under the totalitarian rule of a cosmopolitan elite.

21. Unfortunately, the highest court of the land is still operating under the delusion that they're somehow protecting speech in America. They're not; they have no jurisdiction over the new public square: social media. Jews do though, and we've seen their attitude towards speech:

22. FDR said that "the liberty of a democracy is not safe if the people tolerate the growth of private power to a point where it becomes stronger than the democratic State itself."

This has happened, but it's not fascism we're suffering from like FDR says...

23. It's Judeo-Bolshevism. Jewish advocacy groups have pressured private companies to take a Bolshevik-style stance on speech: speech must first pass through a censoring bureau as per the Communist Constitution. Today's censoring bureau is the ADL ■

24. Needless to say, the highest policy-making authority within the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was the Politburo, initially comprised almost entirely of Jews:
- Lenin ✡
- Trotsky ✡
- Zinoviev ✡
- Kamenev ✡
- Stalin
- Sokolnikov ✡
- Bubnov

But I digress...

25. Interestingly, the First Amendment prevented Communist Jews from suppressing their critics as they did in the Soviet Union. But that still didn't stop Jews like Alexander Trachtenberg from using libel laws unscrupulously to intimidate Americans into silence.

26. However, Jewish censorship started long before the October Revolution. Let's look at a few historical examples of the Jewish propensity for censoring their racial and ideological enemies.

27. Born in 1654, German theologian Johann Eisenmenger had plans to convert to Judaism until he discovered Jews hate Christians. But he continued studying under Rabbis for 20 years until he was an expert. He summarized his findings in a book, Judaism Unmasked.

Jews censored it.

28. In 1895, Jews asked NYC Police Commissioner & future POTUS, Teddy Roosevelt, to ban German preacher Hermann Ahlwardt from holding a rally. Unable to prevent the rally, Teddy assigned Jewish cops to protect him instead.

Hermann famously said "Jews are incapable of patriotism"

29. Incidentally, President Teddy Roosevelt, an ardent philo-Semite, once opined, "It seems to me that it is entirely proper to start a Zionist state around Jerusalem, for peace would only happen if Jews were given Palestine."

Possibly the worst shabbos take in history.

30. In 1913, Louis Marshall, head of the American Jewish Committee got an 1895 anti-discrimimation law amended to outlaw hotels from advertising their businesses as "Christian Only." While these hotels didn't discriminate, Jews felt these ads were offensive to their reputation.

31. Incidentally, Marshall's effort to outlaw "Christian Only" advertisements was the first legislation surrounding group libel in the US. He was also able to outlaw the dissemination of "hate literature" by US Mail. Ironic, because didn't want Jews mixing with "inferior" goyim.

32. Coincidentally, the precedent for group libel that US courts use came from a 1732 London case where Jews immolated a Jewish woman & her child because it was born to a Christian man. The newspaper that reported it also wrote that it was common among Jews - thus, "group libel."

33. To the Jews' credit, immolation was not a common punishment; the Talmud insists women should be stoned and flogged for adultery and infidelity. Perhaps the English newspaper that was found guilty of "group libel" should have consulted the Talmud for accuracy in their article.

34. In what was the first instance of movie censorship, B'nai B'rith lawyer Adolf Krauss and the newly-formed ADL successfully suppressed 1914 film, Rebecca's Wedding Day, because it depicted an impersonation of a Jew.

Jews also censored Oliver Twist and The Merchant of Venice.

35. After its unification in 1871, Germany's criminal code underwent a series of reforms by Socialist Democrat Marxists. Jews like Bernhard Weiss used this code to prosecute Germans 200 times for anti-Semitic speech during the Weimar period, including Goebbels & Julius Streicher.

36. In 1936, the Board of Deputies of British Jews, 43 Group, and other Jewish organizations lobbied British Home Secretary, John Simon, to censor Oswald Mosley's British Union of Fascists from convening meetings and hanging flyers around London.

Eventually, they succeeded.

37. In a 1952 case, the Supreme Court upheld the arrest of a Chicago man for distributing pamphlets that were offensive to blacks (group libel). The court never allowed the man to prove the truth of his assertions & Jewish Justice Felix Frankfurter led the majority opinion.

38. In 1977, National Socialist Party of America planned to protest Jews in Skokie, Illinois, but Jews convinced local councilmen to pass ordinances requiring insurance permits in excess of $250K, thus circumventing the First Amendment.

39. Jewish involvement with censorship - from group libel to hate speech - stems from speech's correlation with anti-Semitism: the fewer restrictions placed on speech leads to more criticism of Jews. So, free speech is anti-Semitic and Jews are necessarily victims of free speech.

40. So, Jews used everything from group libel to legal ordinances to suppress their critics. But these contrivances became obsolete; the Holocaust supplies the justification for censorship now. Its lesson: words lead to action, so laws shouldn't distinguish between words/actions.

41. The Holocaust was immediately used to demonstrate the deleterious effect of free speech during the Nuremberg trials. Julius Streicher, the editor of German magazine Der Stürmer, was ruled to have incited the Holocaust with his anti-Semitic words (not actions).

He was hanged.

42. Two years after the Nuremberg Trials, the Holocaust would deal a fatal blow to free speech. This would come by way of the nascent UN Commission on Human Rights, which set up a committee to draft the International Bill of Human Rights and was chaired by Eleanor Roosevelt.

43. The International Bill of Human Rights was split into 3 parts, two of which were the genesis of current hate speech laws: the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and the International Covenant on Civil & Political Rights (ICCPR).

This was the death of free speech ■

44. After member states ratified the ICCPR, it became legally binding. The UN set up a Human Rights Committee to monitor and ensure each member state is in compliance with the ICCPR's provisions. This precipitated into member states criminalizing speech at the national level.

45. The hate speech clause in the ICCPR proved to be a contentious issue among member states - especially for the US and European countries. As a result, it was added and deleted numerous times, until it was finally added for good.

46. Comprising only 0.2% of the world's population in 1947, the probability that Jews would be involved with the covenants that contravened free speech rights and charged Western governments with legislating morality, should be very low.

But alas, EVERY SINGLE TIME.

47. The man who drafted both the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights was a French Jew named René Cassin.

RIP free speech.
RIP nationalism.
RIP self-determination.
RIP Europe.

48. Cassin re-drafted the original UDHR to remove the free speech clause because a Jew from the Coordinating Committee of Jewish Organizations requested it. Incidentally, a Jewish Holocaust survivor was Cassin's assistant.

This was the singularity of hate speech laws.

49. When the UN member states went to vote on Cassin's draft which included that anti-hate speech clause, every non-Communist European country voted against it...except France, who Cassin was representing.

"In fact, the push for such a clause was led by René Cassin."

50. Poll: Was René Cassin acting in the interests of France or was he acting in the interests of his tribe?

(Keep in mind, France was the epicenter of the Enlightenment, from whence the civil liberty of free speech was born.)

51. But Jewish involvement wasn't limited to just René Cassin, his Jewish assistant, and the Coordinating Committee on Jewish Organizations. The World Jewish Congress repeatedly urged that it was "essential to include an article in the Covenant prohibiting hate propaganda."

52. It's now clear that the Holocaust supplied the moral justification for Cassin's hate speech clauses in the UDHR & ICCPR. So this event, which precludes us from speaking freely everyday, can't even be scrutinized because it's protected by the same laws it helped create ■

53. Since speech that incites hatred and discrimination is protected by the Constitution, the US delayed ratifying the ICCPR until 1992 - ultimately ratifying it without the hate speech clause.

So Jews made censorship a moral imperative for Americans by hijacking our altruism ■

54. Our altruism has been so subverted that we eschew anti-Semitic fact for philo-Semitic fiction. If telling the truth foments hatred for Jews, then the truth must be anti-Semitic. Is anti-Semitism a valid reason to self-censor, even if we're censoring the truth?

55. Here's an example of how we've been morally manipulated to self-censor. Ted Lieu rescinds his comment about Jewish dual-loyalty out of fear of sounding anti-Semitic.

Now, imagine suspecting Jonathan Pollard of dual-loyalty but self-censoring because "anti-Semitism."

56. If speaking truthfully about Jewish behavior foments anti-Semitism, then we must lie out of morality to protect Jews. But how can lying be moral? Lying can only be moral if we don't know we're lying. Hence why Jews sanitize information to absolve themselves of any wrongdoing.

57. Jews want to be the bearers of the final truth, so they curate our reality by filtering every medium of information: tv, radio, internet, etc. Since this information determines our opinions, it's arguable that Jews have more of a right to your opinion than you.

Are we free?

58. With what little freedom we have, we're morally obligated to self-censor because criticizing Jews is anti-Semitic & led to the Holocaust. So we have 2 options:
a) self-censor because it's moral
b) be justifiably penalized in the private sphere by (a) people for anti-Semitism

59. This tyrannical impetus to self-censor is exacerbated by the Jewish mandate for open borders. As our nations get more diverse, we are expected to self-censor more so as to not offend people who have different beliefs. Thus, a consequence of more diversity is less free speech.

60. Incidentally, "diversity is our strength" is the most flagrant subversion of the truth, designed to help Jews stave off nationalism. The prefix "div" means to separate, as in "divide," like the idiom "divided we fall."

>diversity is our strength
>divided we fall

Choose one

61. So should anti-Semitism impugn the truth? The "Conservative" pundit who attempted to ban me obviously believes so, but he doesn't feel the same way about racism. Why the double standard?

"Facts can't be racist, but they can be anti-Semitic!" ■

62. We've now seen the history of Jewish hostility towards free speech: their role in creating group libel laws, censorship in the Soviet Union, hate speech laws in the UN, and private-sphere censorship.

From biblical times to now, freedom of speech has always been anti-Semitic.

63. It doesn't enter the Jew's mind that the optimum condition for their prosperity is the inverse for Western populations. Freedom of speech gives people the right to confront Jews with this reality. Hence, free speech is anti-Semitic.

64. We are welcoming in a new world - a Jewish world - where speaking the truth is immoral and opinions are judged by Jewish censoring bureaus to be either be right or wrong and penalized. Is the "Conservative" pundit who tried to ban me ready for a world like this? ■End.