

Actionable intelligence to live a Free & Inspired Life



# The Solari Report

November 5, 2020

## The Fight for Free Speech with Zach Vorhies



**Summary:** This week on The Solari Report, I speak with Google whistleblower Zach Vorhies regarding his work to halt the purge of independent U.S. media from video provider YouTube. Vorhies has led the effort to find a law firm and crowdfund financing to file a temporary injunction in the California courts. The complaint and crowdfund are linked below.

This Solari Report will be short and sweet—and we will make it public because of the policy contributions that Zach and numerous independent media allies are making on this issue for all of us. Our civilization is being steadily damaged by the secrecy that continues to grow and the corruption that invariably follows.

This is yet another litigation effort worthy of your support. You can see the litigators that we are supporting at the [Take Action Crowdfund](#) page. We will add this one to our crowdfunding.

Solari Report subscribers are in the vanguard of those who are withdrawing or reducing their support of the people and companies engaged in censorship and surveillance capitalism. Thanks for all you do. Let's continue to minimize or stop using or supporting them when and if possible, and communicate with and support the public officials who hold them accountable.

**Bio:** A Google insider who anonymously leaked internal documents to Project Veritas decided to go public in an on-the-record video interview. The insider, Zachary Vorhies, decided to go public after receiving a letter from Google, and after he said Google allegedly called the police to perform a “wellness check” on him.

When Zach Vorhies realized that his employer Google was going to, not only tamper with the US elections, but use that tampering with the elections to essentially overthrow the United States, he decided to blow the whistle. He took the evidence he had gathered to the department of justice antitrust division and came forward through Project Veritas in August of 2019, where those documents still can be found online.

Zach has since been talking about the implications of what he saw happen at Google to the press. He figures it's them who's breaking the law, not

him, and his best chance of making it through unhurt and the story be heard, was to tell and retell it.

Zach, not only details how the search engine actually works to rank results, but also explains how Google may edit content. Like their translation service deleted the word ‘covfefe’ after president Trump used it in 2017, and how Democratic Presidential Candidate Tulsi Gabbard was removed from Google top results after she won one of the debates. Further, Zach talks about how Google has played a role also in destabilizing countries in foreign regime change politics.

Project Veritas has released a new report on Google which includes an undercover video of a Senior Google Executive, leaked documents, and testimony from a Google insider. The report appears to show Google’s plans to affect the outcome of the 2020 elections and “prevent” the next “Trump situation.”

### **Related Information:**

[Project Veritas](#)

[Armenta and Sol Law Firm](#)

**Catherine Austin Fitts:** Ladies and gentlemen, I am privileged to welcome to *The Solari Report* Zach Vorhies, who was a successful entrepreneur and a software developer at Google until he discovered in 2017, I believe, that Google algorithms for censorship. He then became a whistleblower, and now he is one of the leading advocates for free speech and has been a critical part of raising money and bringing a new lawsuit for the purge of independent media.

Zach Vorhies, welcome to *The Solari Report*, and thank you for everything you are doing.

**Zach Vorhies:** Thank you. It’s a pleasure to be here.

**Fitts:** Why don't you give a brief description for those who don't know about your evolution from a successful software developer to somebody very, very concerned about censorship?

**Vorhies:** I guess the story starts at Google right after Trump won the election. I'd been a Google employee for eight and a half years – five years at the time that Trump won the election. What I saw was a company that was dedicated to free speech invert, and they decided they were going to start filtering everything they considered 'fake news'.

This happened in a public discussion held by the company one week after Donald Trump was elected. There were some very disconcerting things that were being said by the CEO, the CFO, and the other C-level executives, including that they wanted to make this election of Donald Trump a blip in history, they wanted to reverse his populism, and they were personally offended at the election of Donald Trump.

What was somewhat skipped but was actually the most important thing was a question related to what Google had done, which was the most effective thing during the election. The response from CEO Sundar Pichai was his statement that the most successful thing was the use of machine learning to filter fake news.

I was like, "Wow! What exactly is fake news? I'm going to go figure it out."

Google is a company that was very, very open – unlike the CIA or Apple, which is incredibly siloed. As a result, I could see what the people at the fake news were thinking because we were all very public with what we were doing inside the company.

I looked at their 'fake news' definition. What I found was that all of the examples of 'fake news' seemed to center around Hillary Clinton, such as, "Hillary Clinton running weapons through Benghazi to arm ISIS," and, "FBI officers who were hot on our case dying."

The exact headlines they were using turned out to be fake news. Still, they were so close to actual headlines that were legitimate that I started to wonder whether

what they were trying to do was to create AI's that were going to falsely and incorrectly censor news stories that were real because it looked like ones that were deliberately constructed to look like they were real was being classified as fake.

I realized that if there was something that was classifying something as 'fake news' then there has to be something that is filtering it out. So I 'dug in', and found what that project was, and it wasn't Project Dragonfly as was popular in the media. As far as I know, that is a fake project. There is no trace of it inside the company.

The one I found was massive. It was a huge undertaking with plenty of internal propaganda, and that project was called Machine Learning Fairness.

**Fitts:** Could you figure out from the documentation when that project began?

**Vorhies:** It began at Stanford, and then it was ingested into the company. It was prior to 2016. I believe the project was started in 2012 at Stanford, and then it was graduated into Google to be systematized.

This Machine Learning Fairness is basically critical race theory; there is an oppressor and an oppressee. So, we need to make everything 'fair' so that we can undo all the oppression. That is essentially what it is.

What they have done is taken AI, which, in this case, is a subtype of AI called 'Machine Learning', which is a collection of neural nets that are similar to brain cells in your brain but they work under similar fashion, and you train them with massive amounts of data. Then they come to their own conclusions about how to classify things. They can usually only classify one thing like fake news on a news article. That is one classifier. Others are in video or in text or in audio.

They create these classifiers off a pile of data, and then you can give it novel data, and it can classify that as well.

This is what they meant by Machine Learning Fairness: Classifiers are specifically designed to be social justice intermediaries and re-bias the entire internet. And they are quite open about them wanting to bias the entire internet.

I remember looking through these slides, and they were describing people as ‘programmable units’, and it was a four-step process. The first step was media-generated. Then it was filtered, and it was aggregated and ranked. The last step was “programming” people like us. Then these programmed people would restart the cycle because they would generate new content as a reflection of that social justice that they were indoctrinated with.

**Fitts:** Once this was migrated from Stanford, is there any evidence to suggest that the design was developed by anyone other than the company? Were there outside influences having input into this design?

**Vorhies:** Yes, there were some consultants, and I have leaked some of those documents with my 950-page disclosure that you can see at [www.ZachVorhies.com](http://www.ZachVorhies.com). But mostly from what I saw, it was inside the company itself. Even though Google was using outsiders like ADL and the SLPC, I didn’t see them having a strong influence on it.

I did see that there were outsiders who had this as a college thesis, and then Google was bringing them in as internal experts to complete this project.

**Fitts:** So, you made a decision to go public. You went public and ‘rocketed’ to great fame, and that is when I first saw you. You gave very impressive interviews and were very cool under ‘fire’ – and there was plenty of ‘fire’.

Then you emerged as a major spokesperson for the First Amendment. Because you are very busy and your time is precious, we are going to jump to your latest accomplishment, which is that we have seen in the last month massive purges of the independent media on social media and the payment mechanisms and various mechanisms on the internet. You have now been part of helping to raise money and lead an effort. You found an attorney to bring a lawsuit on behalf of a group of independent media referred to as ‘Doe et al’. You recently obtained a temporary injunction.

You’ve requested on the internet for an amount of \$130,000, and you have already topped that. I checked that because we are going to donate, and you are already over your quest.

I think you will need some more money, so I hope you come out with another request. But tell us about the purge, tell us about the decision to go for the lawsuit, tell us about how you found the attorney, and tell us a little about where the lawsuit is.

**Vorhies:** Let's start at the beginning. I've been considering that my final phase in this endeavor and this disclosure project would be a justice phase. I've been waiting for the opportune timing for a while. I knew this event that you see right now where everything is being blacked out was going to happen. For example, Twitter is censoring the *New York Post* and their article about the Hunter Biden laptop.

This is very surprising to everyone else, but I see this as a continuation of where Google had been planning, which was to rig the election for Joe Biden or whoever the DNC cutout was going to be. Now that we are here, I've been waiting to do this for a year.

On October 15<sup>th</sup>, Google decided they were going to do a mass purge of Trump supporters. The excuse they used was that 'they were all Q-Anon supporters', which is not true. It is partially true, but it is not fully true. Some of the people mentioned it because everyone is talking about it. This Q-Anon theory is changing the whole political landscape.

The media and the leftist DNC advocated that YouTube should remove these accounts, – or any accounts that were talking about this in a positive light – so YouTube took that initiative. On October 15<sup>th</sup>, they purged it all, and they are continuing to purge. It hasn't really stopped.

**Fitts:** I want to stop you because one of the most important elements of the purge was they gave no notice, they gave no specifics as to why people were being purged, so the absence of both timely communication and any communication is quite astonishing.

**Vorhies:** It is rather astonishing, yes.

This is where we are at right now: There are numerous Trump-supporting patriots who are now without the largest platform in the world. There is an

exodus to all the other ones. YouTube, I'm sure, knew that this would happen, but they timed the purge so that there wouldn't be an ability for a proper reaction in a timely manner. People are weak right now and they can't regroup, and this has the appearance of being a deliberate play to silence one side of the debate so that the preferred Presidential candidate can be supported.

**Fitts:** Am I correct in saying that many of the people purged from YouTube were also simultaneously purged from their payment mechanisms?

**Vorhies:** Yes, it happened within a week. October 15<sup>th</sup> was the YouTube purge, and then by October 23<sup>rd</sup>, it was the Patreon (crowdfunding site) purge, which almost all of these YouTubers were relying on as their main source of income. Now the whole 'rug' has been pulled out from underneath them.

I went to Florida to attend the American Priorities Conference, so I really couldn't do anything until after that occurred. After that happened, and this purge occurred, I was sitting with my friends and we said, "We have to do something. What are we going to do? Let's do a crowdfunding."

So, we really didn't have a plan for PR other than I know that I've done many networks. So, my hope was that I could get a few of these networks to do this. Then if I wrote the copy very well and gave my personal story, the community would show an outpouring of support. That would signal a herd mentality, and everyone would get on board.

That was the gamble. Within the first four hours, it didn't appear to be working and I wanted to call it quits. Then we got that first huge hit, and the money started 'rolling in'.

By the end of the first 24 hours, we had raised a full one-third of the entire campaign. Then I realized that this was definitely working.

On that first day, the interviews started 'rolling in' and the account started to fill up. We tried numerous different ways to raise money and awareness. We did an SMS campaign; we did an email campaign; we did press releases, and we did YouTube. Actually, it was the YouTube that was successful. All the other ones together accounted for approximately 15-20% of the campaign, and the

YouTube appearances were it.

By day two, we had the winning strategy, and we were ‘grinding’ on that winning strategy over and over and over again. We actually stopped actively campaigning two days ago (November 3<sup>rd</sup>) before the fundraiser came to a success, and we coasted to the finish line.

**Fitts:** So, it was quite successful – quick and successful.

How did you find the attorney?

**Vorhies:** I did a careful vetting process through my network of attorneys that I met over the last year – calling them up and asking them many questions. I am somewhat argumentative, and can hold my own. So, I had some epic fights, and essentially, the one who could out-argue me – with me being a domain expert – was the one who I chose. That was Cris.

Also, it has to be in a proper jurisdiction because of the terms of service. So, that was another thing we had to consider.

Cris of Armenta and Sol is the law firm that is representing this group. I’m not part of the lawsuit; I’m not one of the plaintiffs for strategic reasons. She was just the best, so we went along with her. We filed on Monday, and we have already been rendered an action, which on November 2<sup>nd</sup>, we will have our first hearing.

**Fitts:** So, you have gone in with a temporary injunction. What does the temporary injunction ask for?

**Vorhies:** It asks for full reinstatement of everyone who was purged on October 15<sup>th</sup>.

**Fitts:** So, you have a very experienced California litigator. What does your law firm think of the chances?

**Vorhies:** She (Cris Armenta) thinks they are high. There was a dissenting opinion in the Enigma (Software Group vs. Malwarebytes) case where Justice

Thomas carved out exceptions for Section 230 (of the Communications Decency Act), and a limiting scope.

The attorney, Cris Armenta, already had in mind a case like this to challenge the Section 230 and give it a proper scope. She will go ahead and use this case as the one to do it, so we think that our chances are quite high.

Everyone is perturbed right now. There are so many people who are upset. The DOJ ‘throwing the hammer down’ on the anti-trust issues just adds more ‘fire’ to this. So it’s really a hot topic, and this has been in the right strategic timing to put a limit on the Section 230.

Also, because the government has been trying to get people off YouTube for political reasons, this is a perfect First Amendment case; YouTube is really acting as a quasi-state actor.

**Fitts:** So how can we support you, and how can we support the litigation? You may have to go many, many more rounds before this is over. \$130,000 can’t get you the entire way. What can we do to support?

One way is to advertise, so we will to put this up (on *Solari*). We have a crowdfund called the *Take Action Crowdfund* where we put direct links to other crowdfunds that are raising money for litigations. My message to our subscribers is, “What is the point of having more assets if you don’t have an army to protect them?”

**Vorhies:** Right.

**Fitts:** We are trying to encourage support of this kind of litigation. So, we will put a tab up for you and a link to your crowdfund and a link to your website. But what else can we do to help?

**Vorhies:** If anyone wants to support someone with zero overhead, it’s literally me. I don’t have a building that I work in or anything causing overhead.

**Fitts:** So we can donate at your website?

**Vorhies:** Yes, you can donate at my website. You can go to

[www.ZachVorhies.com](http://www.ZachVorhies.com) and see my disclosures of Google. You can also reach out to me on Twitter where I do my political war-gaming. That is [www.Twitter.com/PerpetualManiac](http://www.Twitter.com/PerpetualManiac). That is my 'gamer tag'.

If someone wants to donate to this legal fund, that is [www.PunchGoogle.com](http://www.PunchGoogle.com). We are keeping that open. Even though we've fundraised, people are continuing to donate the money. We are using that for the case because we don't think that this is only going to be phase I; we think it will be phase I, II, and III. So, any additional money that we get will be put towards phase II of this.

If anyone wants to have that tax-deductible donation, I am backed by a sponsor whose name is Dr. Robert Epstein. He is a very famous psychologist who has been in the news lately; he is my mentor. The best way to do that is to reach out to me through the Twitter direct message.

I don't like giving out my personal email.

**Fitts:** Don't give out your personal email, and don't worry; we have your donate page.

One last question: Who are the politicians and the free speech leadership who have been helpful on this issue?

**Vorhies:** It has really been Ted Cruz and Matt Gaetz and Louie Gohmert and Marsha Blackburn. These are the vanguard out there fighting. They really get it. We need to give them as much support as they can get, and God bless them for what they are doing. For example, Ted Cruz today (October 28<sup>th</sup>) grilled all the big tech executives. It was a great thing to see him working on behalf of the people like that.

**Fitts:** So, you would recommend looking at that; I will make sure that we post it.

We are in 'cahoots', Zach. Your job is to tell us what we can do to support you. We will get all this information out to our subscribers, and will publish this next week.

It reminds me of Roger Penske who said, "Speed costs money. How fast do you

want to go?”

So, we just need to put some more ‘gas in your tanks’. Have a wonderful day, and thank you for joining me on *The Solari Report*.

**Vorhies:** Thank you very much, Catherine.

## MODIFICATION

Transcripts are not always verbatim. Modifications are sometimes made to improve clarity, usefulness and readability, while staying true to the original intent.

## DISCLAIMER

Nothing on The Solari Report should be taken as individual investment advice. Anyone seeking investment advice for his or her personal financial situation is advised to seek out a qualified advisor or advisors and provide as much information as possible to the advisor in order that such advisor can take into account all relevant circumstances, objectives, and risks before rendering an opinion as to the appropriate investment strategy.