



Written by [Staff](#) on June 19, 2017

Published in the June 19, 2017 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 33, No. 12

---

## Inside Track

### **Americans Growing More Liberal, Gallup Survey Finds**

Americans are becoming more liberal in their moral values, if the latest Gallup “Values and Beliefs” survey, released May 11, is accurate. According to the polling of a little over 1,000 adults across the United States, the views Americans hold on a core of moral issues “are the most left-leaning or permissive they have been to date,” the report stated.

Among the findings: Ninety-one percent of those surveyed consider birth control to be morally acceptable; 73 percent think divorce is okay, compared to 59 percent of respondents in 2001, when Gallup’s “Values and Beliefs” survey was first conducted; 69 percent were in favor of sex between an unmarried man and woman, versus 53 percent in 2001; 63 percent approved of same-sex relationships, versus 40 percent in 2001; and 62 percent approved of having a child outside of wedlock, versus 45 percent in 2001.

As for abortion, attitudes appear to be more or less the same as they were in 2001: 43 percent approve of abortion on demand in America today, compared to 42 percent 16 years ago. On a positive note, the Gallup poll found that 49 percent of Americans disapprove of abortion.

As for the future, the researchers predicted that “U.S. opinions will continue on this path, as younger, more liberal generations replace older, more conservative ones in the U.S. population.”

A 2016 survey by the Southern Baptist Convention’s Lifeway Research showed that 81 percent of Americans are concerned about declining moral behavior in their country. A total of 46 percent of respondents said that they “strongly agree” with the statement “I am concerned about declining moral behavior in our nation,” with only six percent saying they “strongly disagree” and another 13 percent saying they “disagree.”

Lifeway Research Executive Director Scott McConnell said the survey suggests that “we are shifting very fast from a world where right and wrong didn’t change to a world where right and wrong are relative. We are not all on the same page when it comes to morality. And we haven’t reckoned with what that means.”

### **NSA Routinely Violates Rules Protecting Privacy of Americans**

When Americans living stateside have their data vacuumed up by the NSA’s various and sundry surveillance programs, that information is stored in what is known as the Section 702 database, referring to Section 702 of the 2008 Amendment Act of the 1978 Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA). It is only supposed to be accessible under very specific conditions.

There are at least two major problems with data collection under Section 702. The first is that the NSA gets to interpret its own rules. As a result of that, the agency has historically interpreted the prohibition against targeting Americans to mean that as long as 51 percent of the data collection is foreign, the 49 percent of data that is domestic is fair game. The second problem — as mentioned above — is that the NSA and other agencies routinely access the domestic data, even when the rules forbid that access.

As Circa reported May 24, newly declassified documents reveal a pattern of violating the privacy of American citizens: “The National Security Agency under former President Barack Obama routinely



Written by [Staff](#) on June 19, 2017

Published in the June 19, 2017 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 33, No. 12

---

violated American privacy protections while scouring through overseas intercepts and failed to disclose the extent of the problems until the final days before Donald Trump was elected president last fall, according to once top-secret documents that chronicle some of the most serious constitutional abuses to date by the U.S. intelligence community.”

The Obama administration revealed the violations to the FISA court on October 26. That self-disclosure was just before the election and was likely intended to appear to be above-board before the next president took office.

The FISA court, which customarily rubber-stamps the actions of the surveillance state, was more stringent this time. In a recently unsealed court document dated April 26, 2017, the court censured the administration for not revealing the violations sooner, calling that lack of disclosure an “institutional lack of candor.” The court document also said that the improper searches were a “very serious Fourth Amendment issue.”

This most recent revelation confirms that the surveillance hawks cannot be trusted to keep even the rules they set for themselves.

## **U of Chicago Students Issue Racially Charged Demands to Officials**

A coalition of multicultural student groups known as “UChicago United” presented a list of demands to the University of Chicago on May 19 that the group claims will “serve as the launch of a long-term campaign fight for marginalized students.”

The coalition contends that the campus climate in general “fails to adequately support students of marginalized backgrounds and identities.” To address these concerns, members of UChicago United presented their demands at a campus rally on May 19. Approximately 40 students were in attendance. The rally featured speakers from numerous organizations, including Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán (MEChA) de UChicago, the Organization of Black Students (OBS), PanAsia Solidarity Coalition (PanAsia), Muslim Students Association (MSA), Arab Students Association (ASA), African Caribbean Students Association (ACSA), and the Organization of Latin American Students (OLAS).

Among the demands is a set of “university-funded and run cultural houses, specifically a Black House, a Latinx [pronounced La-teen-ex; the new gender-neutral alternative to Latino/Latina] House, and an Asian House.” The list also demands that the school’s core curriculum include “a new ‘Diversity and Inclusion’ graduation requirement” that would be “primarily focused on any US-centric structural oppression, such as race, gender, and sexuality.”

The list demands an increase in the “recruitment and admission” of “undocumented Latinx students,” as well as “full financial, legal, and mental health resources” for such students. The students also demand the establishment of a “Race and Ethnic Studies Department,” a “Black Studies Academic Department,” an “African Studies Department,” a “Caribbean Studies Department,” an “Asian American Studies Program,” a “Center for African and Caribbean Studies,” and a “Latinx Affairs Office,” all of which would exist independently while still receiving funding from the university.

The coalition demands that the school take money from other organizations that are deemed discriminatory, presumably to fund the demanded initiatives. Sadly, university officials are often all too



Written by [Staff](#) on June 19, 2017

Published in the June 19, 2017 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 33, No. 12

---

happy to acknowledge and affirm student temper tantrums such as this one, and another campus falls prey to the snowflake agenda.

## **Illegal-alien Arrests Up Nearly 40 Percent Under Trump**

Statistics released by Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) on May 17 indicated that during the 100 days since President Trump signed multiple executive orders regarding immigration enforcement priorities, ICE agents have arrested more than 41,000 individuals who are either known or suspected of being in the country illegally. This represents an increase of 37.6 percent over the same period in 2016.

The ICE statement noted that nearly 75 percent of those arrested during this period in 2017 are convicted criminals, with offenses ranging from homicide and assault to sexual abuse and drug-related charges. The arrest of aliens at-large in the community increased by more than 50 percent, from 8,381 last year to 12,766 arrests this year during the same period. Furthermore, the arrest of convicted criminal aliens climbed nearly 20 percent, from 25,786 last year to 30,473 this year.

We reported in January that during a ceremony at the Department of Homeland Security on January 25 honoring DHS's newly confirmed secretary, retired General John Kelly, President Trump signed an executive order to begin construction of a wall on the U.S. border with Mexico and to improve immigration enforcement. This increased enforcement includes ending the "catch and release" policy practiced by the Obama administration. Under "catch and release," illegal border crossers were issued a "notice to appear" and released, instead of being detained and processed for deportation.

Acting ICE director Thomas Homan attributed the drop to a decline in arrests on the U.S.-Mexico border, where deportations of illegal border crossers are usually processed quickly, as well as a lengthy backlog in U.S. immigration courts that issue deportation orders.

Although the Trump administration has prioritized the apprehension and deportation of illegal aliens with criminal records, in the course of their enforcement activities, ICE agents arrest illegals whose only crime is entering the country illegally. Since illegal entry is a violation of our laws, these people are being processed for deportation in greater numbers than they were under the Obama administration, which often failed to enforce immigration law violations.

## **Harvard Study Confirms Media Bias Against Trump**

According to a study by Thomas Patterson, Harvard's Bradlee professor of government and the press, entitled "News Coverage of Donald Trump's First 100 Days," President Trump was the topic of more than 40 percent of all news stories during his first 100 days (three times the amount of press coverage received by previous presidents). The coverage he received "set ... a new standard for unfavorable press coverage of a president."

The 19-page study, conducted under the auspices of the Harvard Kennedy School's Shorenstein Center on Media, Politics and Public Policy, was released to the public on May 18 and demonstrated conclusively that the mainstream media's "fix" is in to portray the 45th president of the United States in the worst possible light. Initially the mainstream media (MSM) was delighted to let Donald Trump take most of the headlines during his campaign for the Republican Party's nominee. Wrote Patterson: "When he announced his presidential candidacy, journalists embraced him, and he returned the favor. Trump received far more coverage, and far more positive coverage, than did his Republican rivals."



Written by [Staff](#) on June 19, 2017

Published in the June 19, 2017 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 33, No. 12

---

But following his nomination, and as his chances improved that he might actually win the presidency over the media's favored candidate, the media changed its tone dramatically: "Only after he had secured the Republican nomination did the press sharpen its scrutiny and, as his news coverage turned negative, Trump turned on the press."

Trump specifically named six of the seven primary sources the Shorenstein study analyzed for bias: the *New York Times*, *Wall Street Journal*, *Washington Post*, *CBS Evening News*, CNN's *The Situation Room*, and *NBC Nightly News*. The study also included Fox's *Special Report* and three European news outlets: the *Financial Times*, the BBC, and ARD, Germany's oldest public service broadcaster.

Initially Trump was "a journalist's dream" wrote Patterson, adding that "reporters are tuned to what's new and different, better yet if it's laced with controversy. Trump delivers that type of material by the shovel full. Trump was also good for business. News ratings were slumping until Trump entered the arena."

Patterson stepped his way through the analysis, noting that "negative news reports outpaced positive ones by 80 percent to 20 percent.... In no week did the coverage drop below 70 percent negative and it reached 90 percent negative at its peak."

He noted that coverage by CNN and NBC "was the most unrelenting — negative stories about Trump outpaced positive ones by 13-to-1 on the two networks. Trump's coverage on CBS also exceeded the 90 percent marker. Trump's coverage exceeded the 80 percent level in the *New York Times* (87 percent negative) and *Washington Post* (83 percent negative). *The Wall Street Journal* came in below that level (70 percent negative), a difference largely attributable to the *Journal's* more frequent and more favorable economic coverage."

The MSM's coverage during Trump's first 100 days "was not merely negative in overall terms," wrote Patterson, "[but] it was unfavorable in every dimension. There was not a single major topic where Trump's coverage was more positive than negative."

Some topics, such as Trump's immigration policies, generated negative to positive ratios that exceeded 30 to 1. Coverage on healthcare reform and Russia's alleged involvement were 87-percent negative, while MSM coverage of Trump's appointees, his personal background, his foreign policy, and national defense positions "were at least 80 percent negative," said Patterson.

It was all of a pattern, concluded Patterson: "When Trump's category-by-category coverage was examined for each of the seven U.S. news outlets in our study, a consistent pattern emerged. The sources of Trump's most and least negative coverage were similar for every outlet, except for Fox News."

Patterson noted that "the media's credibility is at a low ebb [because of] a belief that journalists are biased." There's no longer any need to speculate about the media's deliberate determination to destroy the Trump administration with their biased reporting, if they can. As Patterson was closing his analysis, he noted that the battle will continue for as long as Trump is in office: "The news media gave Trump a boost when he entered presidential politics. But a head-on collision at some point was inevitable. It's happened, it isn't pretty, and it isn't over."



## 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.