

MATRIX ENTERTAINMENT  
Presents

A  
James Jaeger  
Film

# **SPEECH**

*The Door is Closing?*

Narration Script

Copyright 2022  
by James R. Jaeger II  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Originated: 16 March 2022  
Revised: Numerous times  
Supplemented & Revised: 21 September 2022  
Revised & Polished: 09 October 2022  
Title Change: 09 October 2022  
Numerical Chapters added: 10 October 2022

MONTAGE: Google's gmail "IP Blocking" list scrolls by as all forms of speech -- mouths talking, books, written words, drawings, photos, moving images, radio dishes, cell phones -- superimpose.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### NARRATOR

When the Founding Fathers wrote the U. S. Constitution they emphasized that freedom of speech -- like freedom of religion and the right to defense -- is an unalienable right.

The Founders also affirmed that unalienable rights are NOT granted by any government or human entity. Unalienable rights are a gift from the Deity and thus cannot be revoked by any government or human entity.

Thanks to the Internet, for the first time in history, people from all over the world are able to SPEAK to each other in real time.

Unfortunately, technical marvels that facilitate SPEECH can also provide the means to abridge that speech.

This documentary is about SPEECH and the unconstitutional abridgement of that SPEECH -- what has become known as "CANCEL CULTURE." Why has cancel culture developed, how has it been implemented, and what can WE THE PEOPLE can do to restore total, unabridged free speech in America and the rest of the world?

## 2. PRIVATE COMPANIES

The First Amendment of the U.S.

Constitution guarantees that Congress -- which includes all aspects of the GOVERNMENT -- will not pass any law -- or take any action, overtly or covertly -- to abridge speech, including freedom of the press -- what we now call the "Media" or the Mainstream Media.

But if the First Amendment applies to GOVERNMENT, does it apply to PRIVATE COMPANIES? Most feel it does NOT. To such, private companies -- especially "private" Mainstream Media companies -- can use or abuse speech any way they want. And they do, they:

Trash religion as an affliction of the insane; re-define speech as "money" for buying congressmen; kick U.S. Presidents off social media sites; interpret the scientific method any crackpot way they want; destroy careers for any trivial political expedient; sell pharmaceutical drugs that facilitate mass shootings in elementary schools.

Indeed, private companies -- especially the MEDIA COMPANIES -- can raise hell. They can put out any speech THEY want, but censor anyone's speech they DON'T WANT. And they do. They use high-tech algorithms to Shadow Ban, Demonitize or Block any film, video, book, email, tweet or podcast they decree is "hate speech, misinformation, or spam."

Private media companies can ignore WE THE PEOPLE's right to assemble by suppressing speech on social media sites, what has become the "electronic public square." They can also force WE THE PEOPLE to sign "Terms of Service" agreements that are long and opaque contracts of adhesion.

### 3. PUBLIC CORPORATIONS

These things said, an argument could be made that "private companies" are not PRIVATE at all. They're creations of the government, known as "corporations." Corporations are not sole proprietorships, partnerships or private companies at all. They're artificial entities created and licensed by the state complete with charters and "by-laws."

And big corporations, such as movie studios, TV Networks and Social Media Tech Giants, are even less "private." These entities are "PUBLIC corporations" -- meaning they're owned by the public, thousands of people in the general PUBLIC, not just a handful of PRIVATE stockholders.

Given this, one could argue that "public corporations" are actually mini governments and thus subject to the First Amendment by reason of that alone. If so, they may NOT create "by-laws" or "terms of service agreements" that "abridge" speech. They may not abridge the unalienable right of free speech and then hide behind the corporate veil, or the status of a "private company".

By the same token, the government -- including its agencies and departments -- may not hide behind NGOs or media companies and mandate they censor or deplatform in the name of some political party's agenda. And evidence shows this has been happening.

So let's take a deeper look and see how high-tech censorship is being used to corral WE THE PEOPLE into "politically correct" speech -- what amounts to the covert dissemination of Marxist indoctrination to the American public.

#### 4. COLD CALL SALES

"You first have to declare a dog MAD before you can shoot it." -- Edwin Vieira

"You first have to declare a word SPAM before you can censor it." -- Jack Rooney

In the century surrounding the development of American Industry, salesmen, even children, went door-to-door selling Girl Scout cookies, flower seeds, Amway soap products and Fuller brushes.

This use of free speech -- known as "cold call sales" -- has been in practice for over 200 years. Not only did INDIVIDUAL salesmen use cold call sales, small BUSINESSES as well as major CORPORATIONS used them.

To this day, cold call sales is how people and companies start and grow. There was a day when every company started out and had no sales. That company had to take the initiative and reach out to someone and ask them if they wanted to buy their product. They had to "cold call sell". They had to use "unsolicited" speech to reach out to a potential buyer.

#### 5. THE TECHNOLOGY OF EMAIL

When the technology of email was invented, for the first time, small Mom & Pop businesses had the ability to reach out to millions of potential customers using an electronic version of the age-old American tradition of "cold call sales."

Prior to email, the small business owner had to pay ridiculous sums to advertise -- and, as any business owner knows, the income produced from usually-over-priced-ads rarely pays for the cost of the advertisements.

Email technology changed all this. Rather than paying thousands of dollars to reach just a few hundred "eyeballs," Mom & Pop businesses across America could now send out a few thousand emails for just pennies.

Instead of buying advertisements and TV spots from ad agencies, newspapers and networks for usurious, unconscionable prices, small business owners could get actual results from "cold call sales" through inexpensive email.

But inexpensive email was a technology that also enabled competition, a sin to the socialist mentality. Yes, consolidated Big Box Stores, Mainstream Media and Internet Distribution Monsters were exposed to increased competition from the 32 million Mom & Pop businesses that could now compete due to inexpensive but effective email marketing campaigns.

## 6. SPAM AS UNSOLICITED SUBMISSIONS

Is it thus any surprise established Corporate America, Madison Avenue and especially the Mainstream Media ganged up on the Mom & Pop businesses and vilified "cold call sales" done by "email"? To do this a new word was invented: SPAM -- what could be short for Psycho People Against Mail, or people known as "Spamaphobics."

Spamaphobics were the first to adapt a practice in Hollywood -- known as "unsolicited submissions" -- to email.

An "unsolicited submission" is any material -- usually a manuscript or screenplay -- that's SUBMITTED to a Hollywood agent, studio executive, or publisher without permission.

In other words, an unrepresented writer can't just send in their first screenplay even if it's CASABLANCA or GONE WITH THE WIND. They have to wait until the studio executive or agent ASKS them to send it in. Of course no agent or studio exec is ever going to ASK because the whole idea is to screen OUT unsolicited submissions. In other words minimize competition.

The idea that millions of new and original "content creators" around the world would COMPETE with Hollywood's bevy of 47 "studio-approved," union writers is anathema to Marxists in the Mainstream Media CONTROL GROUP.

So the practice of rejecting submissions on the grounds they are "unsolicited" prevailed and eventually set the groundwork for today's CANCEL CULTURE. Now any unsolicited SPEECH is not only rejected, it's vilified. "Cold call" email is "unsolicited" speech and branded as so-called SPAM. The dog is mad, so we need to shoot it.

But since when does SPEECH have to be SOLICITED? Isn't SPEECH an unalienable RIGHT, a right given by the DEITY? Since when does one Human Being have to get PERMISSION from another Human Being to speak?

The whole idea is preposterous, yet the "unsolicited speech" meme has been institutionalized by the Hollywood-driven Mainstream Media and enforced by what could be called "Speech Police".

Speech Police -- Hollywood bred guardians of morality and ethical conduct -- have now spread to the New York Networks and Silicon Valley Social Media companies as well as Madison Avenue Advertising Agencies and their corporate clients.

So when the Speech Police say they hate "spammers" they are, in essence, saying they hate competition. In other words they hate capitalism.

This is the real reason Speech Police vilify email as "spam" -- they don't want capitalism to survive because they know that "cold call sales" built the American Middle Class, the engine of capitalism. In essence, SPAM built AMERICA.

Now that we have seen two key ways censorship has been institutionalized -- by hiding behind "private companies" and by vilifying email as "spam" -- let's take a look at the history of censorship and how it's evolved.

## 7. SHORT HISTORY OF CENSORSHIP

Down through the ages, censorship has evolved from crude, overt tactics to sophisticated, covert tactics.

For instance, 2000 years ago Jesus Christ was censored on a cross for teaching people to love and forgive each other.

Then, 422 years later, Giordano Bruno was censored at the stake for teaching people that the Earth revolved around the Sun.

Eventually, less brutal forms of censorship were used, a favorite being excommunication, whereby an offending parishioner was forced to disconnect from his family and friends.

These forms of censorship have been popular throughout history. Yes, human beings did their best to shut each other up with the limited technologies of the day, but it took modern technologies to really shut people up.

Possibly the most modern was the invention of the motion picture camera in 1891. After this, the censorship game took on an entirely new dimension.

Today, whereas it costs about 60 cents to mail a letter and less than a penny to send an email -- it costs \$100 million to produce and market a feature-length motion picture.

Given this, present day Hollywood movies are the most expensive form of mass communication yet devised.

The U.S. Supreme Court in its decision of *Burstyn v. Wilson* puts it this way: 'the motion picture is a significant medium for the communication of ideas and an essential part of our democracy.'

It follows that, if the motion picture is a significant vehicle of speech, the motion picture INDUSTRY is in the vanguard when it comes to both the expression AND evolution of culture. In other words, Hollywood leads the culture and politics is down stream from culture.

It should thus come as no surprise that one of the oldest and most famous speech suppression technologies is the Hollywood Blacklist.

A Blacklist is an unwritten "list" of people that studio executives and agents use to facilitate their crimes of favoritism, cronyism and nepotism. In other words, Blacklisting is reserved for talented "loose cannons," such as Orson Wells and Mel Gibson.

Thus, as we move through Hollywood history, it's easy to see that the potentially "incorrect" speech that can be delivered by \$100 million feature films to massive audiences needed to be carefully controlled in more ways than mere Blacklisting. After all, allowing millions of people across the world to watch movies that promoted "nasty" ideals like capitalism, competition, free-markets, nationalism or any kind of non-socialist, non-Marxist political, economic or cultural SPEECH could never be permitted.

This is why Hollywood pioneered many of the early speech-suppression technologies that have been passed down to television and Social Media companies of today.

But exactly what was the evolution of speech suppression? To answer this question we must take a look at the early Internet and how freedom of speech flourished -- at first.

## 9. THE EARLY INTERNET

From the early 1990s to the mid-2000s, the violence, hate and Marxist propaganda of Hollywood movies was largely absent from the Internet.

Even though early technologies of speech suppression -- again, what would evolve into "cancel culture" -- came from Hollywood, it took major studios a long time to expose their multi-million dollar motion pictures to the Internet. Video-on-demand was in its infancy, and music piracy was rampant.

Prior to 1996, and the enactment of Section 230 of the Telecommunications Act, there were no social media sites other than a web portal known as America Online. This embryonic social media experiment merged with the Hollywood studio, TimeWarner, in 2000 to form AOL-Time Warner. But before long the whole consolidated mess came down like a pile of burning rubber.

After this, Hollywood really stayed away.

And while it did, joyous Netizens -- people who practically LIVED on the Internet -- got together in social networks, like alt miscellaneous screenplays and discussion forums like FIRM and the MIND-X.

These were the first "electronic public squares" where people from all over the world came together to enjoy the free speech facilitated, if not guaranteed, by Section 230 of the Act. It was the virtual Wild West where anyone could visit any website and shoot off their mouth.

The discussions were new, original and often heated. But ideas were flying, differences were being ironed out, people were experiencing people and SPEECH was glorious, intense and educational.

Millions, almost billions, were communicating with each other for the first time in Human history. Sharing thoughts, hopes and dreams.

Wow, free speech! "We don't just work here, we figure things out," said a 4-year old kid at a computer running Netscape Navigator.

#### 10. SECTION 230 IMMUNITY VS MODERATION

But eventually the Speech Police moved in. They moved in with their big egos, small IQs and stricter interpretations of Section 230. They called themselves MODERATORS.

At first they said they were here not to censor, but to just make sure everyone "stays on-topic." That's the actual term they used to "justify" their policing. "You're off-topic," they would caution.

The "regulation mentality" found the idea "reasonable" -- especially to control those abusing immunities provided by Section 230. So moderators doubled down on speech suppression and so-called OFF-TOPIC soon became ANY topic that was not ON-TOPIC, i.e., the politically correct topic.

Viewpoint discrimination was thus in full bloom by 2009. Discussion forums, and the Internet in general, became increasingly quarrelsome.

But Netizens were not quarreling over the substance of the speech: they were quarrelling over the intrusions of the Moderators. Arguments became about whether a certain Moderator's reprimands were justified or not.

In this way, moderation initiated the destruction of the very free-speech enabled by Section 230 immunity. And Moderators did it in the name of micro-managing the direction of conversations. It was moderation for the "good of the community" -- what later evolved into "Community Standards".

Bogus substitutes for the Bill of Rights were thus born. The frog in the kettle was starting to get hot, but he did not take action.

## 11. SHADOW BANNING

Given the high-tech nature of the Internet, it was only a matter of time before Human Moderators would be replaced by Machine Moderators known as "algorithms." But unlike Orwell's "Thought Police," Machine Moderators never sleep.

For instance, they continuously "Shadow Ban" -- a high-tech application of the Hollywood Blacklist -- a form of Machine Moderation whereby movies, videos, music, posts, websites and other "CONTENT" is subtly minimized or banned to the shadows.

It's a technology, effectuated by Artificial Intelligence, that senses popular, but "politically incorrect" CONTENT, and makes sure such rarely shows up in search results. Usually victims do not even know they have been shadow banned.

Case in point: the 2005 release of FIAT EMPIRE featuring Congressman Ron Paul, had millions of views, was rated #1 video on the Internet and won a Telly Award. Then views mysteriously fell off after Dr. Paul announced his candidacy for president -- as a Republican!

It was as if the film was deleted from the Internet. FIAT EMPIRE -- and 9 subsequent conservative documentaries -- were thus Shadow Banned and no one even knew it happened for years.

## 12. DEMONITIZING

Along with Shadow Banning, Demonetizing was becoming increasingly popular with the Speech Police on video streaming platforms and at the New York advertising agencies.

Demonitizing is the practice of paying a video content provider and then gradually or abruptly cancelling payments.

The classic era of Demonitizing -- known as the Adpocalypse -- started in 2017 when legacy Mainstream Media realized that a significant portion of their audience was migrating to YouTube. YouTube had to somehow be vilified.

Madison Avenue Ad Agencies were thus motivated to take up the challenge because YouTube was an attractive new market for their "family-friendly" corporate clients, corporations like a sugar-peddling Coca-Cola and a drug-peddling Johnson & Johnson.

Using a similar strategy as "declaring the dog mad," the New York Agencies got to work eradicating competition in the name of "hate-speech."

First on their list of "haters" happened to be the most popular channel on YouTube -- PewDiePie -- accused of posting, what else, but an anti-Semitic video.

Mainstream Media content creator, DISNEY, immediately cancelled a deal with PewDiePie setting off a chain of demonitization events when advertising agencies threatened to pull ad dollars. The Big Ad Agencies were thus able to force YouTube to demonetize 8 million creative and unique, free-speech videos -- 99.999% of which were NOT anti-Semitic -- just MORE creative than DISNEY's tired and hackneyed product.

This economic extortion wiped out 6 million video content creators who would otherwise have been serious competition for Madison Avenue and their corporate clients, the New York TV networks and even the major Hollywood movie studios.

Madison Avenue insisted on vilifying, censoring and extorting YouTube unless they deleted or demonetized countless independent videos. All of this was done to thwart competition, political and economic.

Now, instead of being more creative OR "family-friendly," YouTube is looking more like Network TV every year -- saturated with the same obnoxious TV commercials spamming WE THE PEOPLE every 5 minutes. Talk about "unsolicited submissions."

### 13. DEPLATFORMING

The practice of demonitizing is similar to the practice of deplatforming -- both remove income from the victim or create a "chilling effect" on the victim's speech.

As early as the 1940s, Communist speakers were often banned from university campuses. They were denied "speech platforms", a term that has been extended to any large venue, including radio, TV, movies and now, social media such as Twitter, Facebook and YouTube. Deplatforming thus simply means, "kicked off."

When Speech Police from the Mainstream Media and Corporate America realized "media power is political power," they also realized that now was the time to usurp whatever political power they could by dictating who will HAVE "platform" and who will NOT.

Thus, in the name of "fighting bigotry" and "hate-speech" or promoting family values and women's rights, the Speech Police started deplatformed all manner of celebrities. Even major stars were kicked off movie and TV sets for no reason other than they were suspected wife-beaters, child-molesters, Christian-conservatives or said something stupid, like "Jews run Hollywood".

Harvey Weinstein, one Jew that actually DID run Hollywood, was rightfully deplatformed, but what about Mike Lindell, J.K. Rowling and Piers Morgan? Did the "pillow guy" really deserve to be banned? Only a Censor Nazi would say "yes".

In short, WE THE PEOPLE experienced the pinnacle of free speech abridgement when the President of the United States -- Donald Trump -- was banned from Twitter.

Didn't we learn anything from the Supreme Court case of Marsh v. Alabama? Or were agencies and NGOs in the Government and Deep State telling Twitter who to deplatform and what to censor? Hopefully Texas House Bill 20 will remedy violations of the First Amendment like this and be an inspiration to other states.

Let's take a look at how even regular people, who just send emails, are now being deplatformed - what's known as Blocking.

Earlier we saw how Speech Police have vilified EMAIL as so-called SPAM. We'll now take a look at how technology has enabled Speech Police to, not only abridge EMAIL, but eradicate it entirely.

The technology is known as BLOCKING, and it comes in two flavors: Machine Blocking and Human Blocking.

On the early Internet only Humans could BLOCK. If someone sent you an email you didn't want -- no problem -- you just clicked on the unwanted email and the email app on your personal computer would send the email to a "kill file", what we now call a "junk mail" file. All future emails from the unwanted sender would thus be automatically blocked by YOU on YOUR personal computer. YOU, not the Speech Police, were in control of your email communications.

Today Machines do much of the blocking -- AI algorithms control and block personal email communications without your authorization or knowledge.

Case in point: if your mother is using Gmail, and your email has been Blacklisted, all of your email to her will be automatically routed to her "junk mail" folder. Your mother will never know you wrote. She may even die thinking you never cared.

In other words, a billion dollar corporation a thousand miles away, unilaterally decided what emails your MOTHER will see and what will be blocked.

But what if it's not your MOTHER?! What if it's your business associate or LAWYER that's being blocked?! Is this not invading the attorney-client privilege?

And worse, what if Google blocks your doctor, exacerbates an emergency and someone dies?!!!

This is why "tampering with the US-mail" is a Federal crime: there can be serious repercussions when speech is blocked. If so, why is "tampering with the E-Mail" not also a federal crime when, regardless of INTENT, the AFFECT can be the same?

Blocking -- unless consented to and performed by the INDIVIDUAL email recipient -- is tampering with the mail and a serious abridgement of First Amendment Speech. That such abridgement is done by a Section 230-protected "private company" should not confer immunity.

When corporations, like Google, Spamhaus, SpamAssassin, Bogfilter, DSPAM, POPfile and SpamPal take it upon themselves to unilaterally decide what email CONTENT is CONSENSUAL and what email is so-called SPAM, it can have serious, if not fatal, consequences.

This kind of SuperBlacklisting and IP Blocking is nothing less than the mass global censorship of Human speech. It's a Marxist-styled, central planning of worldwide email communication by Speech Police hiding behind governments and their alter egos: public corporations.

Human blocking, when done by an INDIVIDUAL on his or her personal computer, is okay. But blocking is NOT okay when it's done unilaterally by a Machine Moderator at some billion dollar corporation a thousand miles away.

It's time WE THE PEOPLE demand ALL government-derived entities, their agencies and departments -- including public corporations, FBI, CIA, NSA, DHS, Deep State Apparatchiks and so-called "private" companies and NGOs -- stop tampering with the mail, the E-mail and the G-mail.

## 15. CONTENT VS CONSENT

Given the blatant censorship and blocking that runs rampant at "large email service providers" -- like Gmail, Yahoo, Earthlink, etc -- it's no surprise that Speech Police are also operating at email Marketing Companies like Constant Contact, Freshmarker, GetResponse, GoDaddy, Mailjet, SendBlaster, MailChimp. These companies -- who live in terror of being blocked themselves by the "large email service providers" -- defend their "anti-Spam policies" by claiming the blocking is "only about CONSENT, not CONTENT."

Your EMAIL was labeled "SPAM" -- NOT because it contains conservative, constitutional or Biblical CONTENT -- it's because you didn't get CONSENT from subscribers on an "opt-in" email list BEFORE sending the emails.

In other words, Speech Police routinely hide behind circular logic shields: if your CONTENT isn't "politically correct," no one CONSENTS to receive it because such content is SPAM. And it's SPAM because no one CONSENTS to receive it. The dog has been declared mad and that's why we had to shoot it.

With this twisted logic, it's no wonder rampant censorship continues across the Net while the biggest spammers on the planet are the Mainstream Media and their unsolicited CONTENT in the form of Madison Avenue TV advertisements. Ever see any insurance or pharmaceutical commercials?

Until WE THE PEOPLE wise up, the false accusation of "SPAM" will be used to shut down free speech as well as Mom & Pop businesses across America.

Is the abridgement of a competitive marketplace of ideas good for a democratic or capitalist society? Apparently Karl Marx and the Speech Police feel it is. Surely the American frog is now feeling the heat.

## 16. COMMUNITY STANDARDS

Other than Blacklisting, another masterful form of speech abridgement is the high-tech bible known as "community standards."

Community Standards force WE THE PEOPLE to submit, NOT to the Bill of Rights set forth in the U.S. Constitution, but to Contracts of Adhesion set forth in Terms of Service Agreements.

The Contract of Adhesion is a contract between parties of greatly differing bargaining power -- for instance, a multi-billion dollar studio and a starving screenwriter. The studio offers the screenwriter \$99 for a 120-page screenplay and tells him, "that's our final offer, take it or leave it."

Similar take-it-or-leave-it contracts have been happening to musicians, actors and painters for hundreds of years -- but who cares about artists?

Now Contracts of Adhesion are happening to millions of people when they confront a Terms of Service agreement. Suddenly everyone cares.

A Terms of Service agreement is that impossibly-long and opaque contract you are required to click-off on if you want to join some social media platform, such as Twitter. Unless you click -- "I agree" -- you can't join.

But once you join, the "Terms of Service" agreement allows them to treat you any way they want. If they don't like your "speech" or you are Donald Trump or Jordan Peterson, they can kick you off the platform and dream up any nebulous "reason" they want.

After all they're a \*PRIVATE COMPANY\* -- THEY don't have to abide by the First Amendment. But YOU have to abide by their "Community Standards" Welcome to Contracts of Adhesion -- take it or leave it.

In the end, Community Standards are little more than "justifications" for the abridgement of free speech because almost every person, political group and entity has some pet "reason" THEY should be able to moderate speech. The list is long and pathetic, but includes the following:

It could have altered the election  
 If it keeps Orange Hitler out  
 They are racists or bigots  
 They are domestic terrorists  
 They are anti-government  
 It's a conspiracy theory  
 It's for the greater good  
 It's homophobic of hate speech  
 They are anti-semitic  
 They are selling snake oil  
 They are inciting violence  
 They are being intolerant  
 It's a military secret

It's misinformation  
 It's not politically correct  
 It's right-wing extremism  
 It's for security reasons  
 It's spam  
 It's top secret or a trade secret  
 It's not science or open to debate  
 It's unsolicited material  
 It's white supremacy  
 It needs to be fact-checked

And that catch-all reason: it violates community standards.

What this list boils down to is simple: speech that does not align with some individual, private company or government's interests, values, cultural perspectives and/or prejudices is "fair game" for First Amendment Abridgement.

#### 17. CANCEL CULTURE

So what is motivating "Cancel Culture" -- an Orwellian Society where an individual exercising "politically incorrect" speech is ostracized by various Special Interest Groups, including political parties?

In a sentence: Cancel Culture is the steady contamination of Western Culture with Marxist values, interests, cultural perspectives and prejudices. It's an assault that started after the economic and political defeat of Leninist Marxism.

A Marxist splinter group -- known as the Frankfurt School -- figured out a better way to "bury" Western Civilization. They would translate economic and political Marxism into cultural terms -- what would be come known as "Cultural Marxism".

Then they would infiltrate academic speech centers in New York and California with endless books and lectures.

The goal was to indoctrinate liberal arts college professors, get them to flirt with socialism and then accept Marxist doctrine as a better way than capitalism and a Constitutional Republic.

They did this using three primary social-engineering technologies -- critical theory, cultural pessimism and androgyny. They then moved beyond Academia to capture corporate America.

From corporate America emerged the first crop of students that would be employed as executives at the Hollywood studios. These would go on to green-light the \$100 million liberal, secular, Marxist movies that would corrupt American Culture from the 1960s onward.

This attack on American Culture is known as "the long march through the institutions" -- institutions that are Speech Centers of the United States.

In short, the Frankfurt School's "Long March" would proceed from intellectuals in Academia, to executives in corporate America, to Children at the movies. It's now marching through Social Media platforms in Silicon Valley and boils down to who controls the PLATFORMS. Who dominates the SPEECH CENTERS of the cultural institutions?

With the election of Mainstream Media celebrity, Donald Trump, the CULTURAL INSTITUTIONS went berserk. The Speech Police were matched at their own game and put on notice: Globalism is out and Nationalism is in. Collectivism is out, individualism is in.

This was not the Hollywood CONTROL GROUP'S plan. The Speech Police mobilized their arsenal: the U.S.

Mass Media Oligopoly which includes the Hollywood-based Movie Studios, the New York-based TV Networks, the Mainstream Media Conglomerates and the Silicon Valley-based Social Media Tech Giants. A challenge to the Frankfurt School's "Long March" would not stand.

Just like the movie, Marxists in Academia, Corporate America and Hollywood became UNHINGED. Their only imagined "solution" would be to stop debate. Abridge Speech. Cancel Culture - Western Culture.

So what can be done?

#### 18. WHAT CAN BE DONE

Here are suggestions as to how WE THE PEOPLE can act to revitalize Constitutional principles, free-market competition and respect for our Christian heritage.

- 1) The First Amendment guarantees that Speech from any individual is natural and okay, if not God-given - - so make it so.
- 2) Central management, blocking, censorship and/or abridgement of Speech, overtly or covertly, should be illegal, socially unacceptable and/or considered immoral.
- 3) More Speech should always be used to fight propaganda and abridgement. Never less.
- 4) Individuals who can't debate, or don't want to debate -- should be given the personal tools to block or attenuate speech they don't want.
- 5) Unsolicited Blocking or banning should never be done or permitted by a central authority.

6) Laws like Texas House Bill 20 should be passed, duplicated in the states and made a Federal Law.

It all boils down to this: when private companies, corporations, public corporations or governments (or their agencies or departments) arrogate unto themselves the power to infringe Speech -- directly or indirectly, overtly or covertly -- on media platforms or email, they are in effect trying to central plan and manage human thought. This is not what the Founding Fathers envisioned.

#### 19. THE DOOR IS STILL OPEN

As bad as it seems, the door is still open a crack. Most Americans know that freedom of speech, like freedom of religion and assembly, is not only vital and precious, it's God-given.

Americans -- defined as people who know and apply the U.S. Constitution as interpreted by the original intent of the Framers -- will never surrender their SPEECH, their RELIGION or their GUNS.

Given the events of the day, it's easy to see that, if WE THE PEOPLE do nothing -- if we don't support a wider spectrum of speech over alternative media -- Cultural Marxist propaganda will continue to corrupt America.

Again, the door is still open -- but only to the degree WE THE PEOPLE act. A careful understanding and application of the U.S. Constitution, the Bill of Rights and Christian principles that made America great, can and will, make America greater than ever before.