

VIMEO, THE VIDEO COMPANY, IS A NEST OF WOKE, CENSORING, GEORGE SOROS-LIKE HIPSTERS

Vimeo is a lie and a propaganda sham operation. Everyone needs to join forces to bankrupt Vimeo and inform all of their advertisers and users about them

Vimeo has shown it's spots. Meet Vimeo's censor: "Shawn". This is one of the shills that works at Vimeo to prevent anything true from ever being seen in a documentary video if it exposes George Soros or any of the financier's of Biden/Obama. Obama, Biden and Vimeo are financed by the same people. They will always allow videos about baby deer and sad millennials on their platform, but if your film utters one word about the White House Vimeo will destroy all of your videos, text and user links. Shawn is assumed to spend their evening sucking of Soros and their day deleting anything that George does not like, pledging to BLM and building digital pipe bombs.

Take Shelley, for example. She had ten years of carefully curated videos on Vimeo. They had been doing fine. Her VIMEO site suddenly had a surge in readers and VIMEO decided they did not want any more people to see her videos because some of the documentaries expose bribery and political corruption that Vimeo's investors are involved in.

Shawn at Vimeo wrote Shelley to say that he and Vimeo had destroyed all of her videos, erased all of her text and deleted all

of her years of carefully acquired users. Shawn refused to point to any film or content that had caused this. Shawn gave the typical Big Tech lie that one of her thousands of videos was not to Vimeo's liking but refused to say which one and deleted all of her years of work.

It turns out, Vimeo does this all the time

Jim Jordan, in the United States Congress, has promised to investigate Vimeo. Many consumer lawsuits and class-action cases are ramping up to now slam Vimeo-the-sucking-video-site.

Christians be warned. Vimeo will censor you if it doesn't like what you have to say. The video sharing company has a net worth of about \$2.8 billion and about 170 million users. But its "heavy-handed censorship" is growing, too.

In 2020, Vimeo branded the American Family Association a "terror or hate group" and shut its account down. AFA's Executive Vice President Ed Vitagliano noted that the Bible teaches that sex outside of marriage and homosexuality are sinful and Vimeo characterized this as "hate."

Vimeo censors have often targeted Christian content including biblical teaching on sex and testimonies of people who left homosexuality.

It ordered Pure Passion Ministries (PPM) to take down testimonies from former homosexuals. When PPM founder David Kyle Foster asked why these were a violation, he was told: "To put it plainly, we don't believe that homosexuality requires a cure and we don't allow videos on our platform that espouse this

point of view. Please remove any and all videos that discuss homosexuality as a condition requiring healing.” Later, Vimeo closed down PPM’s account and yanked the entire video catalog.

Contact Vimeo: Contact Page, Facebook, Twitter or by mail: 555 West 18th St., New York, NY, 10011.

[Vimeo proves that](#) something has gone seriously wrong with the Internet.

Online speech is more heavily restricted than ever. A few large companies, which share a progressive bias, control what can be said on their platforms and curb the circulation of politically sensitive news, such as the New York Post’s 2020 report on the troubling contents of [Hunter Biden’s laptop](#).

Yet politicians in both parties believe the Internet is still too freewheeling. And as Republicans take aim at pornography and Democrats target hate speech, the Supreme Court is hearing two cases in which tech companies stand accused of promoting terrorism.

The family of [Noheми Gonzalez](#), who was murdered by Islamic State terrorists in Paris, is suing [Google](#), while relatives of Nawras Alassaf, a Jordanian man IS extremists killed in Turkey, are suing Twitter. In each case the claim is that the tech company shares responsibility for the slaughter because its policies made extremist materials readily available.

Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act shields companies from much legal liability they would otherwise face for what appears on their platforms. Many conservatives

contend the provision also makes it easier for tech companies to engage in political discrimination.

Nohemi Gonzalez, a CSULB student, was killed in the 2015 Paris attacks.

MediaNews Group via Getty Images

A Supreme Court ruling against Google or Twitter would narrow Section 230's scope and add momentum to legislative efforts to revise the law. It would also make the tech companies more gun-shy. Confronted with the risk of more lawsuits, the Internet's gatekeepers will crack down.

Most Americans would welcome that where Islamist radicalism is concerned. But the tech companies have shown they have a distinctly partisan idea of what constitutes domestic extremism. The progressive notion of "hate speech" covers much more than the advocacy of violence.

Can the tech companies be trusted to draw the right lines between actual extremism and conservative politics that Mark Zuckerberg or Bill Gates — or some millennial manager — finds distasteful?

We already know the answer.

Progressives, for their part, are just as confident they know whether Republican legislators can be trusted to distinguish between pornography and art.

Mark Zuckerberg is often called out for Facebook censoring freedom of speech.
Bloomberg via Getty Images

Neither party trusts the business leaders or officeholders of the other to protect its freedom of speech — including the freedom

of religious speech.

Yet both parties and their allies are drawn toward imposing more constraints on Americans' speech, taking us further down the road the tech companies have already been traveling.

Where does it end?

When the World Wide Web was in its infancy, conservatives and progressives saw unlimited possibilities in it. Conservatives could circumvent the liberal-leaning mainstream media. Progressives and libertarians celebrated the Internet's "Do anything you want" ethos.

All expected the "information superhighway" to bring government closer to the people, fulfilling the dream of what Ross Perot called an "electronic town hall."

Twitter is being sued for having a part in the slaughter of innocent lives because its policies made extremist materials available.

Anadolu Agency

The early 21st century, the golden age of blogging, posed few of the problems that seem unsolvable to today's strictly policed social networks. There was offensive and indeed extremist material online. But to find it, one had to know where to look.

Blogs answered to no digital landlord like Facebook or Twitter. Anyone could start one, though the amount of writing necessary to sustain a blog was more than most people could attempt.

see also

[Google faces Supreme Court in case that could decide future of Section 230](#)

In those days, the closest thing to a social network was the informal web of links between different sites. Those links were curated by individual writers and editors.

Facebook and Twitter lowered the entry barriers. Now anyone could have a presence online and access to an already-thick network of connections.

The price of convenience and universality, however, was coming under the private governance of [Big Tech](#): its owners, its human hall monitors and its algorithms.

Tech companies got rich, but they also came to feel they had to take moral responsibility, even if they shirked legal responsibility, for what everyone read and wrote.

So here we are. The blogs have link-rotted away, nearly everyone has a social-media presence, and Big Tech is evolving into Big Brother. Government reinforcement of Big Tech's role as the nation's censor seems inevitable.

With great power comes great political responsibility — even if no one thinks the tech companies are worthy of this role.

What do you think? [Post a comment.](#)

As the daylight web draws tighter, stifling legitimate speech, the unregulated dark web will predictably grow stronger. Tech censorship risks breeding the very evils it's meant to combat.

There are only two ways out. One is to restore the decentralized messiness of the early Internet, where writers and editors were responsible only to themselves and the public law, not to corporate overlords. The other is to let Congress buy Twitter, or another network, so the protections of the First Amendment apply in the virtual town square as well as in what's left of the real one.

<https://cis-india.org/news/vimeo-ban>

[Vimeo Ban: More Web Censorship](#)

When Indian users logged on to **Vimeo** and some other video-sharing websites Thursday morning, they were greeted by a rather unusual message: "Access to this site ...

<https://www.viewpointdiversityscore.org/news/what-every-company-can-learn-from-vimeo-s-cancelation-misstep>

[What Every Company Can Learn from Vimeo's Cancellation Misstep](#)

"We can confirm that **Vimeo** removed the video in question for violating our Terms of Service prohibiting discriminatory or hateful **content**," ...

<https://www.breitbart.com/tech/2023/01/26/vimeo-censors-documentary-about-parents-protecting-children-from-transgender-surgeries-as-hateful-conduct/>

[Vimeo Censors Documentary About Parents Protecting Children ...](#)

"We can confirm that **Vimeo** removed the video in question for violating our Terms of Service prohibiting discriminatory or hateful **content**," the ...

<https://www.law360.com/articles/1403636/court-to-probe-vimeo-win-in-gay-conversion-censorship-suit>

[Court To Probe Vimeo Win In Gay Conversion Censorship Suit](#)

Jul 16, 2021 ... **Vimeo** said it has long banned "hateful and discriminatory" **content** from its platform and argued that gay conversion is "a scientifically ...

<https://www.dailysignal.com/2020/10/26/youtube-vimeo-remove-conservative-entrepreneurs-covid-19-video/>

[YouTube, Vimeo Remove Conservative Entrepreneur's COVID-19 ...](#)