

**SermonIndex Announcements :: [Announcement ] In light of Twitter and Facebook Censorship****[Announcement ] In light of Twitter and Facebook Censorship - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2021/1/12 7:52**

Saints,

In light of all the censorship of Twitter, Facebook, Google, Apple and other major tech platforms, I have been prayerfully considering any steps we have to take with SermonIndex. A lot of these things are extreme reactions to Trump but could end up being policy that are long-term on their platforms. And in the end could also envelope conservative Christians as a soft target.

So in light of these things I am prayerfully considering these steps:

- 1) Re-start Email mailing list and promote it on all social platforms so at least some of the social audience would have a direct connection with sermonindex for any news updates.
- 2) Lessen the amount of posts on social media platforms.
- 3) Take down social platform links from website, so we do not promote them from our platform.
- 4) Work on putting sermonindex up on social media alternative platforms to prepare if those are mass adopted by conservatives.
- 5) Work on video site backups to have all our youtube videos on 1-2 more platforms.

Any other ideas or advice from the SermonIndex community would be appreciated and of course prayers are always necessary!

**Re: [Announcement ] In light of Twitter and Facebook Censorship - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2021/1/12 7:54**

Also a side note that in the past the discussion forums were much more used on SermonIndex, but because of Facebook popularity essentially everyone has decided to use that platform for interactions.

But in light of what has happened perhaps it will be good to see a positive step of believers back to older forums like this for their godly conversations.

I also know personally many Christian forums that have closed or have minimal interaction because of social media popularity.

**Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2021/1/12 9:06**

Quote:  
-----Brother Greg said: A lot of these things are extreme reactions to Trump but could end up being policy that are long-term on their platforms.  
-----

Call it discernment or whatever, I'm not on Facebook. I'm not going to say I saw this coming, because I didn't, but I just never really felt comfortable about Facebook.

**Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2021/1/12 10:57**

Greg - I do not know where your web host is located but you could consider moving it to another country.

I know that Iceland is building a "free speech zone" with companies dedicated to preserving the privacy of individuals and businesses.

I know of a hosting company in Iceland called "Orange Host"

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2021/1/12 19:51**

Quote:

-----Greg - I do not know where your web host is located but you could consider moving it to another country.

I know that Iceland is building a "free speech zone" with companies dedicated to preserving the privacy of individuals and businesses.  
-----

Brother,

The main site is hosted in the USA and also using Cloudflare, and other services based mostly in the USA. Thanks for your wisdom, it might be good to consider getting some or alot of the site off-shore.

The audio and video content, I am continuing to try and diversify.

For those saints on MEWE social, our page is here: <https://mewe.com/i/sermonindex>

**Re: - posted by staff, on: 2021/1/14 6:50**

Hi

I think we discussed this before and a while back SI on youtube? went down but this is obviously the real thing.

We can clearly see the pattern

They will flag posts or content as untrue or as incitement or discrimination,or against rules we dont know about.

Then they will start taking down content

Then they will start legal action etc

Whatever they are doing to Trump at the moment they will do to US and why wouldnt they .

We know that eventually if its not this time or the next ,they will get to pull down our digital platform but we are not to make it easy.

I am on Facebook but I am going to leave or ease my way off when I get a different way to communicate as a protest to the censorship on a personal level.

What to do?I really want to come up with some helpful suggestions ,the only one I can think of is if we could somehow do what "NAPSTER" did who shared music files mp3s.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Napster>

The idea was that the files were shared by thousands of people and if I wanted to download a song I could download it from numerous sources .Basically the files were not in a central location but in thousands of places.Napster the original version was closed down as it was using other peoples music without paying royalties.

Im sure we could set up a Christian Napster sharing our sermons (which are legal) but as to the technicalities of this or the cost of the software ,I do not know.

Like with all technology any solution to this Anti Christian world will be some kind of temporary .

Hope this might be helpful,

urs staff

**Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2021/1/15 15:16**

Thank you for sharing these thoughts. I would like to add something about the biases of Big Tech and how they pertain to Christians.

I live in the very heart of the Silicon Valley. It is a beautiful area -- but one that has shifted far to the left in terms of policy, morality/immorality, righteousness/unrighteousness, etc. The big issue in the tech industry is that these corporations have come to understand their power and influence.

In the past, it was commonly assumed in American politics that corporations were guided (politically) by profit motives. The conspiracy theory was that the Democratic Party was the "party of the common man" and that the Republican Party was the "party of the rich and businesses."

Obviously, in history, this has never really been accurate. The Republican Party was the party -- guided largely by the Christian faith -- that wanted to outlaw slavery, protect personal and collective (including religious) freedoms and assert a right of self-determination.

Yet, in reality, the massive tech and media corporations in the Silicon Valley, Hollywood and NYC/DC media corporations are guided by profits. More specifically, these corporations recognize that profits can be maximized globally. Since China and India represent more than 1/3 of the entire global population, there is money to be made (particularly via China).

Thus, these corporations are guided by a desire to maximize profits. To do this, they have to influence policy. The American political party that finds globalism acceptable is the very party that these industries are cozy with.

So, in the pursuit of these profits, they've tried to redefine what is acceptable speech, belief and policy. The idea of "nationalism" -- the notion that a nation exists to preserve the ideals that the nation collectively holds -- is the ultimate sin to them. It is a stumbling block to fiscal mammon. They would gladly drop anything important to a country in the pursuit of gain.

At the same time, this underlying motivation has become a type of "religion" that these corporations adhere to and promote. They are guided by them. Thus, the idea of influencing political or moral opinion is perfectly acceptable in that pursuit.

A few years ago, I applied for a job at a well-known tech company in the Silicon Valley. After going through a series of interviews, I made it as one of a few finalists. I went through a couple of "work" interviews (where I submitted assignments). I was finally told that I was one of the two finalists for the position.

In the final series of interviews, I was invited to a group interview with three individuals. I noticed that some of the questions were very strange. They asked which websites I visit often. They asked which sources I go to on a daily basis for "news."

I responded with some carefully-worded responses -- true answers that were somewhat guarded given the peculiarity of these questions. Their questions became very particular. It seemed like they were trying to learn (without asking) whether or not I was a conservative, a Christian, etc.

Finally, I asked them something like this: "Are you trying to learn where I stand politically? If so, I can tell you."

They all relaxed and smiled. They explained to me that their company had long been accused of "liberal bias." This complaint had grown considerably -- to the point that they were worried that it would affect their business (since there are more self-identified conservatives than self-identified liberals in America).

Since they were expanding their newsroom and presence before a presidential election, they decided to conduct an internal audit. They didn't think that there was any blatant bias. However, they were surprised by their findings.

It turned out that there wasn't a single conservative, libertarian or Republican working in their company's news division. The only third party supporters were a couple of socialists and one "Green Party" person. Every other person was a Democrat and/or considered themselves "liberal."

In addition, they audited their internal website submissions. They discovered that there was bias from the selection of art

icles, selection of photographs and the wording of blurbs and the wording of headlines (often rewritten to say something that the article itself might not be implying).

They explained that the purpose of this new position was that they wanted to hire ONE "strong conservative" (someone who wouldn't be antagonistic toward conservatives, conservative morals or religious faith). The goal was that this person would offset the very loud outcry of "liberal bias" that they now understood existed in their website.

I told them that I thought that the best way to avoid such biases is to take steps that would actively avoid biases. One woman responded, "That is easier said than done."

Ultimately, they went with the other applicant (a Stanford professor). Oddly enough, I knew of this applicant and how he was accused of being a "RINO" -- a social liberal who claimed to be a traditional conservative Republican. In fact, he didn't last four months at the company. They subsequently called to offer me the job, but I turned it down.

With the Trump Administration, much of that antagonism is rooted in his administration's unwillingness to allow unbridled trade/manufacturing with Communist China. In addition, much of the tech industry is filled with foreign workers -- most of which are antagonistic toward Christianity (and its influence on the Republican Party's platform).

We now live in a time in which Big Tech, Big Media and Hollywood don't even pretend to be neutral. They actively allow certain political, moral and religious views to be attacked. If you express hesitation about radical Islam, they'll call you an "Islamophobe." That same media outlet will have no problem with mocking Christ Jesus or commercializing and secularizing anything about Jesus.

One person that lives near me was engaged in a conversation about the supposed "war on Christmas." I asked him, "How would Muslims feel if we secularized Ramadan" -- turning it into a time to buy things and even adding cartoonish mascots in the media to most associate with it?" I asked what if the same thing was done with Hanukkah, Passover/Pesach, Diwali, etc.

I explained that if a website or YouTube channel attempted to "despiritualize" the meanings behind other sacred celebrations, feasts, festivals, beliefs, etc. of other religions, then they would probably be banned for "hate speech."

Yet, these corporations are now actively targeting conservatives on the basis of a mob mentality pressed by a false narrative (that is perpetrated by the media and tech corporations themselves). It is a tactic that I think that the Beast of Revelation will use.

Now, the Supreme Court might take up these cases. There is a strong argument that these corporations are now an oligopoly attempting to thwart competition -- including political policy competition.

The big issue is that they are now attempt to squash competition online (e.g., Parler, etc.). They are also trying to destroy any ideals that differ from their profit-motivated goals. The constitutional question is that they are impeding speech, press, assembly and the exercise of faith by failing the "neutrality" test.

Obviously, faith cannot be legislated. However, immorality, unrighteousness and ungodliness can be. For years, the people calling out for "separation of church and state" have no problem with "immorality and state." They want Christians to have no voice while radical left-wing social, economic and political groups can have a voice in policy and government.

For me, I care about this because I am alive for such a time as this in a place such as this. The people of America are my neighbors. My family lives here. I feel that I have an opportunity to share my voice (through a vote and even sharing my thoughts online). Now, both of those are under attack -- and the media and tech industry dismisses our concerns about it.

I suspect that there will be a series of lawsuits soon. Parler has already sued Amazon. However, I think that the tech corporations will be sued by individuals -- and churches -- for using their power to remove them. I just wonder how the courts will respond.

**Re: - posted by staff, on: 2021/1/15 18:48**

Hi cccHriiss,

Their is alot in your post and you bring the agenda down to the basic practical level of how they are trying and are succeeding to control at every level but not heaven.

I post this video of JACK DORSEY CEO OF TWITTER,

Laying out his plans for the future on how he is going to censor conservatives .Its shocking but expected by SI members

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HOMMddytpoM>

urs staff