



Written by [Staff](#) on June 6, 2016

Published in the June 6, 2016 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 32, No. 11

Inside Track

UN Plots War on Free Speech to Stop “Extremism” Online

The United Nations Security Council wants a global “framework” for censoring the Internet, as well as for using government propaganda to “counter” what its apparatchiks call “online propaganda,” “hateful ideologies,” and “digital terrorism.” To that end, on May 11 the UN Security Council ordered the UN “Counter-Terrorism Committee” to draw up a plan by next year. From the Obama administration to the brutal Communist Chinese regime, everybody agreed that it was time for a UN-led crackdown on freedom of speech and thought online.

The UN will reportedly be partnering with some of the world’s largest Internet and technology companies in the plot. Among the firms involved in the scheme is Microsoft, which, in a speech before the Security Council on May 11, called for “public-private partnerships” between Big Business and Big Government to battle online propaganda. As this magazine has documented, Google, Microsoft, Yahoo, and other top tech giants have all publicly embraced the UN and its agenda for humanity. Many of the more than 70 speakers also said it was past time to censor the Internet, with help from the “private sector.”

According to UN officials, the plan to regulate speech on the Internet will complement another, related UN plot known formally as the “Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism.” That crusade will include, among other components, planetary efforts to stamp out all “anti-Muslim bigotry,” anti-immigrant sentiments, and much more, the UN and Obama explained. “Non-violent extremism” is also in the UN’s cross hairs, as is free speech generally.

But the real solution to terror is neither a stronger UN nor a global war on ideologies, extreme or otherwise. Empowering the UN to wage a global war on ideas, ideologies, propaganda, and speech is itself an extremist proposition riddled with extreme dangers. A far simpler answer to the scourge of terrorism would be to defund the UN, arrest those supporting terror groups, and stop propping up dictators and terrorists with taxpayer money. Anything else is a dangerous fraud.

Pew Research: Middle Class Is Losing Ground

A new study released on May 11 by the Pew Research Center indicates that middle-class Americans are losing ground as a share of the population, especially in metropolitan areas. Pew’s analysis was based on its study of U.S. government statistics found in the 2014 American Community Survey and the 2000 Decennial Census. During the period bracketed by those two surveys, the percentage of Americans whom Pew would classify as “middle class” fell in 203 of the 229 metropolitan areas in the United States. The decrease in the middle-class share measured six percentage points or more in 53 metropolitan areas, compared with a four-point drop nationally.

These findings reinforced a previous analysis completed by the Pew Research Center, released to the public last December 9, indicating that the U.S. middle class had declined to the point where it makes up slightly less than 50 percent of the U.S. adult population. Not all of the people who left the middle class fell into poverty, however; some climbed into the upper-income category. The share of wealthy households rose, from 17 percent in 2000 to 20 percent in 2014, as did the share of poor households, which increased from 28 percent to 29 percent during the same time period.



Written by [Staff](#) on June 6, 2016

Published in the June 6, 2016 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 32, No. 11

In another survey taken by Pew in December of 2015, 62 percent of respondents said the federal government does not do enough for middle-class people, compared with just 29 percent who said it does the right amount and six percent who said it does too much. A majority of those surveyed also said the federal government doesn't do enough for older people, poor people, or children.

What few people understand is that if the federal government would cease doing so much to "help" all of these groups of people, then the money spent to pay for these unconstitutional programs would be left with the states and the people, who could then better afford to help themselves, and each other. In such a scenario, a future Pew poll would very likely indicate that the middle class was growing instead of shrinking.

Immigrants Receive More Welfare Than American Citizens

According to a May report by the Center for Immigration Studies (CIS), legal and illegal immigrant-headed households receive an average of \$6,241 in welfare, 41 percent more than native households, which receive an average of \$4,431. That represents a total cost of \$103 billion in welfare benefits to those households, the *Washington Examiner* wrote on May 9.

The report follows up on a September 2015 study from CIS that found that 51 percent of immigrant households receive some type of welfare, compared to 30 percent of native households. The study reveals that immigrants from Mexico and Central America were the major recipients of welfare benefits, averaging \$8,251 annually — "86 percent higher than the costs of native households," the report indicates. Conversely, immigrants from other parts of the world receive significantly less welfare than even native-headed households. The report shows that the average European immigrant household receives \$3,509 in benefits and the South Asian immigrant household receives \$2,565 on average.

The report's author, Jason Richwine, noted that while illegal immigrants cannot receive benefits directly, they are able to receive welfare benefits through their U.S.-born children, though possibly not as much. Illegal immigrant households receive an average of \$5,692, while legal immigrants receive \$6,378.

The report finds that on average, immigrant households receive 33 percent more cash welfare, 57 percent more food assistance, and 44 percent more Medicaid benefits than the average American household. Furthermore, an analysis by the Heritage Foundation, cited by Richwine, revealed that in 2010, immigrant households paid \$4,344 less in taxes than they received in services.

Mark Krikorian, executive director of CIS, noted that failure to change the current immigration policy will force taxpayers to continue to foot the bill for immigrant households. "If we continue to permit large numbers of less-educated people to move here from abroad, we have to accept that there will be huge and ongoing costs to taxpayers," he wrote. Richwine determined that the findings point to one conclusion: A significant change to the welfare state is an absolute necessity.

FDA: Popular Antibiotics Have Serious Side Effects

The Food and Drug Administration (FDA), the agency charged with preventing harmful drugs from coming to market, recently confessed that certain antibiotics it approved can have "serious side effects" that "generally outweigh the benefits."

On May 12, the FDA issued a safety alert concerning fluoroquinolone antibacterial drugs. Such drugs



Written by [Staff](#) on June 6, 2016

Published in the June 6, 2016 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 32, No. 11

“are associated with disabling and potentially permanent serious side effects that can occur together,” reads the alert. “These side effects can involve the tendons, muscles, joints, nerves, and central nervous system.”

Despite mounting evidence of the dangers of these drugs, however, the agency has been extremely slow to warn the public. Attorney Larry Klayman, a former federal prosecutor, thinks he knows why and has filed a federal racketeering lawsuit to prove it. The suit, filed on behalf of several patients who were harmed by Levaquin, alleges that Dr. Margaret Hamburg, who served as FDA commissioner from 2009 to 2015, used her position of authority to suppress information about Levaquin’s side effects in order to enrich herself, her husband, and Johnson & Johnson.

Hamburg’s financial interest in Alkermes also led her to buck an FDA advisory board’s overwhelming opinion that the company’s painkiller Zohydro should not be approved, plaintiffs charge. Although the advisory board voted 11-2 not to approve the drug because of its potential for abuse, the agency nevertheless approved it.

Putting control of the pharmaceutical market into the hands of political appointees and bureaucrats is a recipe for corruption. The FDA regulates drug companies, who in turn supply employees to the FDA, and vice versa. The very existence of the FDA lulls many Americans into a false sense of security concerning drugs. If the FDA approves a drug, they reason, it must be safe; yet clearly that is not the case. Without the government giving its imprimatur to certain drugs, consumers would be far more wary and would seek out additional sources of information on those drugs before consuming them, as many already do.



Written by [Staff](#) on June 6, 2016

Published in the June 6, 2016 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 32, No. 11

Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.