



Correction Please

Trump Accused of Burying Collusion Charges



Item: *On May 21, an online article by the New York Times Editorial Board appeared under the headline “Trump v. the Department of Justice.” The article claimed — once again — that President Trump is using inflammatory hyperbole to dodge “the Russia investigation” as it “burrows closer to the Oval Office.” In particular, the opinion piece — slanted so far to the left as to not be able to see the right — claims that President Trump’s tweet the previous Sunday demanding that the Department of Justice (DOJ) “look into whether or not the FBI/DOJ infiltrated or surveilled the Trump Campaign for Political Purposes — and if any such demands or requests were made by people within the Obama Administration” is evidence that “President Trump sank to a new low” in trying to quash the investigation.*

The article goes on to challenge the reader to “consider the seriousness of the threat posed by a president ordering federal law enforcement officials to investigate the people who are investigating him.” In fact, the article opens with: “As the old saying goes, if the facts are against you, argue the law. If the law is against you, argue the facts. If both the facts and the law are against you, pound the table and yell.”

The article maintains that tone throughout, flogging the stillborn horse of Trump/Russia collusion with no fewer than 10 references to allegations that the Trump campaign — and perhaps even Donald Trump himself — colluded with Moscow in the 2016 presidential election. By contrast, the article makes one three-word overt reference (“Look, a mole!”) and a mere three shaded references to the recent revelation that the FBI had at least one spy in the Trump campaign.

Item: *In an online article dated May 19, the Associated Press (AP) claims to ferret out the answer to the question, “Where did Trump’s claim of an FBI mole come from?” Referring to the established fact that 73-year-old Cambridge Professor Stefan Halper infiltrated the Trump campaign for the purpose of spying for the FBI as an “explosive theory” and an “unverified claim,” the article states that “Trump has used similar claims in the past to try to discredit the Russia investigation.”*

As proof that this is a tired, old Trump tactic, AP provides exactly one example: President Trump’s claim that the Obama administration “ordered wiretaps on his phones during the election.”



Written by [C. Mitchell Shaw](#) on June 18, 2018

Published in the June 18, 2018 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 34, No. 12

Correction: This is far from the first time the *New York Times* has ignored the most basic of journalistic principles to twist facts beyond recognition, but it may be one of the most glaring. The “newspaper of record” really went out of its way this time. In an effort to spin the major story that the FBI had (likely illegally) inserted a spy into the Trump campaign into an anti-Trump hit-piece, the “Gray Lady” showed that she is no lady at all; ladies, after all, are expected to be honest. First, there is no evidence whatsoever that the “Russia investigation burrows closer to the Oval Office.” In fact, as this magazine has reported in multiple previous articles — both online and in print — after more than a year of burrowing (a good choice of words to describe the various investigations), not one piece of evidence has been uncovered that Donald Trump or anyone in his campaign colluded with Russia in the 2016 election. Period.

In fact, the House Intelligence Committee’s report of its year-long investigation — in which the committee “interviewed 73 witnesses, conducted 9 hearings and briefings, reviewed approximately 307,900 documents, and issued 20 subpoenas” — “found no evidence of collusion, coordination, or conspiracy between the Trump campaign and the Russians.” And while the liberal media chose either to ignore the committee’s findings or claim that the report was evidence of GOP spin, the salient fact is that Democrats have had to admit the same thing: No evidence of collusion. Even Representative Adam Schiff (D-Calif.), the most vocal Democrat accuser, has admitted as much. And he has done so at least twice.

In April 2017, Schiff told CNN’s *State of the Union* that there is no solid proof that there was ever any link between Russia and the Trump campaign. “I don’t think we can say anything definitively at this point,” he said. Almost a year later, Schiff appeared on the *View* and attempted to dodge the question of whether there was evidence that would be “enough for [Special Counsel Robert] Mueller to bring charges.” When pressed, the most he would say is that it “looks a lot like collusion.” However, saying that it “looks a lot like collusion” is not the same as saying that there is evidence of collusion. So, since there is no evidence, there is nothing for the president to dodge or quash. The *Times*’ Editorial Board may — like Schiff — want there to be evidence, but wanting doesn’t make it so. If it did, Hillary Clinton would be president.

As for the *Times*’ claim of “the seriousness of the threat posed by a president ordering federal law enforcement officials to investigate the people who are investigating him,” consider the alternative: A president is stripped of his executive power to order the DOJ — which is directly under his authority — to investigate crimes committed by someone simply because they are investigating him. This is a clear attempt by the *Times* to dodge the real question: Did the Obama-era FBI break the law by planting a spy in the Trump campaign for political purposes?

The real answer to that question is obvious in light of the facts. Text messages between FBI agent Peter Strzok and his mistress, DOJ lawyer Lisa Page (who were both assigned to the Clinton e-mail investigation and the Trump/Russia investigation), mention a “secret society” within the FBI and DOJ that worked to protect Clinton while attacking Trump. The messages also mention a meeting in the office of then-FBI Deputy Director Andrew McCabe addressing an “insurance policy” the “secret society” had in place in case Trump won the election.

It appears that both the facts and the law are on the side of Trump and against the Editorial Board of the *Times*. Perhaps that explains the *Times*’ proclivity to “pound the table and yell” about Trump/Russia collusion even as the narrative collapses under its own bloated weight.



Written by [C. Mitchell Shaw](#) on June 18, 2018

Published in the June 18, 2018 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 34, No. 12

The AP article is another prime example of the regurgitation of liberal pablum in place of — and in a naked attempt to distract from — the facts.

First, the only real answer to the question, “Where did Trump’s claim of an FBI mole come from?” is that despite the best efforts of Deep State operatives in the FBI and DOJ, House Intelligence Committee Chairman Devin Nunes (R-Calif.) and his investigators managed to discover the fact that Halper had infiltrated the Trump campaign as an FBI spy. Following up on that, Nunes — finally fed up with being “stalled” and “stonewalled” even after issuing a subpoena for information about Halper — threatened to hold Attorney General Jeff Sessions in contempt of Congress if the information was not forthcoming.

In a clear case of attempted misdirection, the AP article ignored the fact that Trump’s “wiretap” claim was based in solid fact and was true. While Obama himself may not have signed off on the electronic surveillance, his administration did indeed order and conduct it. Furthermore, in at least one instance — the electronic surveillance of Trump campaign associate Carter Page — the Obama FBI and DOJ bent rules past the breaking point, misleading the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court to obtain a warrant for that surveillance.

Similarly, by referring to President Trump’s “claim of an FBI mole” as an “explosive theory” and an “unverified claim,” the article ignores established facts. For instance, on May 23, former Director of National Intelligence James Clapper appeared on the *View*, where he told the anti-Trump women’s panel, “Unfortunately, the identity of this informant is now out in the media.”

If the man who was, at the time of the mole being planted in the Trump campaign, the director of national intelligence (whose office oversees the FBI and other intelligence agencies) says there was an “informant” planted in the campaign, then it is a fact, not a theory, and a verified, rather than unverified, claim. And while it would be tempting to forgive AP’s mischaracterization (since it was made *before* Clapper made his verifying remark) the wire service has not only not corrected the error, but has doubled down on it. In an article headlined “Seething over Russia probe, Trump tears into ‘spygate’” and dated May 24 — a day *after* Clapper’s remarks on the *View* — AP stated, “It remains unclear what, if any, spying was done. The White House has given no evidence to support Trump’s claim that the Obama administration was trying to spy on his 2016 campaign for political reasons.”

Given the way both the *Times* and AP have ignored the known facts to spin the very real revelation that the FBI planted a spy in the Trump campaign, one would reasonably be led to believe that they are little more than two outlets of the media arm of the Deep State.

— C. Mitchell Shaw



Written by [C. Mitchell Shaw](#) on June 18, 2018

Published in the June 18, 2018 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 34, No. 12

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.