



Written by [Staff](#) on June 22, 2020

Published in the June 22, 2020 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 36, No. 12

Inside Track

Trump: U.S. Out of WHO; No More Chinese Spies Posing as Students

President Trump announced the end of U.S. membership in the World Health Organization on May 29, and he also suspended the entry into the United States of “students and researchers” from Communist China who have been identified as “potential security risks.”

The move against WHO came 11 days after Trump’s letter to WHO Director-General Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, a communist apologist for Communist China who is not a medical doctor.

On May 18, Trump had written a long indictment of WHO and the Communist Chinese, who hid the truth about the Asiatic pathogen that caused a global pandemic, which in turn stampeded U.S. authorities into locking down the U.S. economy.

“We will be today terminating our relationship with the World Health Organization and redirecting those funds to other worldwide and deserving, urgent, global public health needs,” Trump said during a news conference mainly directed at describing Communist China’s global treachery, industrial espionage, and control of WHO.

During the last 10 years, the U.S. contribution to the globalist health agency, a subsidiary of the anti-American United Nations, has ranged from a low of \$212 million in 2014 to a high of \$513 million in 2017.

The strike against WHO was only part of a candid indictment of the Communist Chinese and their campaign to spy on and steal from the United States.

Trump continued, “The People’s Republic of China (PRC) is engaged in a wide-ranging and heavily resourced campaign to acquire sensitive United States technologies and intellectual property, in part to bolster the modernization and capability of its military, the People’s Liberation Army (PLA).”

Trump’s proclamation ends the “unrestricted entry” of those spies.

Former CBS Head Admits: Yes, Mainstream Media Is Biased

Van Gordon Sauter, a former president of CBS News, was caustic in an opinion piece that appeared in the *Wall Street Journal* on May 25: “The media seems uninterested in ... issues of bias.... The news media seems very comfortable with its product and [its] ability to sell it.”

Long gone, says Sauter, is any semblance of fairness or balance: “To many journalists, objectivity, balance and fairness — once the gold standard of reporting — are not mandatory in a divided political era and in a country they believe to be severely flawed.... Much of journalism has become the clarion voice of the ‘resistance,’ dedicated to ousting the president, even though he was legally elected and, according to the polls, enjoys the support of about 44% of likely 2020 voters.”

How can the media restore its lost credibility? Sauter says it should just admit to its blatant liberal bias instead of trying to hide behind whatever might be left of its former credibility. Remarked Sauter, “It would be delightful if a publisher, an editor, would just say: ‘Yes, I am left of center! I’m proud of it. I think our reporting is accurate. It best serves the public ... and the credibility of the media. So there!’”



Written by [Staff](#) on June 22, 2020

Published in the June 22, 2020 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 36, No. 12

Sauter admits to an obvious fact: “The highly influential daily newspapers in New York, Washington, Los Angeles and Boston are ... decidedly liberal.... The three broadcast network divisions ... have their liberal tilt. Two of the three leading cable news sources are unrelentingly liberal in their fear and loathing of President Trump.”

One legacy of President Trump’s first term is that the public has become increasingly aware of that bias. A comprehensive survey by pollster John McLaughlin (reported by the *Washington Times*) revealed the public’s awareness of the bias. When asked, “Regarding the national media’s coverage of President Trump’s handling of the coronavirus emergency, would you say that too many members of the media have been unfair, biased and even disrespectful to the president?” almost half of those polled agreed.

Pennsylvania Election Judge Admits Stuffing Ballot Box for Democrats

It is a Democratic Party article of faith that little to no election fraud ever occurs in the United States. Because of this, it is not surprising that we have heard little to no public condemnation of the action taken by a Philadelphia election judge in taking thousands of dollars in bribes in order to increase the vote totals for three different candidates for Common Pleas Court judge in 2015. Other Democratic candidates were the beneficiaries of the ballot-box stuffing admitted to by Domenick J. DeMuro, who pleaded guilty of depriving voters of their civil rights with his election fraud scheme.

DeMuro, 73, also admitted that he had violated the Travel Act by using his cellphone to aid him in his illegal activity.

U.S. Attorney William McSwain announced the guilty plea on May 21. “Our election system relies on the honesty and the integrity of its election officials. If they are corrupt, the system is corrupt, which creates opportunities for election fraud and for the counting of fake votes,” McSwain said to reporters in a video-recorded statement.

“DeMuro fraudulently stuffed the ballot box by literally standing in a voting booth and voting over and over, as fast as he could, while he thought the coast was clear,” McSwain added. “This is utterly reprehensible conduct. The charges announced today do not erase what he did, but they do ensure that he is held to account for those actions.”

An unnamed political consultant paid DeMuro between \$300 and \$5,000 for each election, DeMuro admitted, to add votes for Democratic candidates for local judgeships, as well as for candidates running for other offices — local, state, and federal. According to the plea, the consultant took money from the candidates and used part of that money to pay DeMuro, who was an election judge in south Philadelphia.

It is difficult to believe that this is an isolated case, confined to Philadelphia or Pennsylvania.

Trump Cuts Aid to Big Tech, Citing Bias and Censorship

President Donald Trump issued an executive order on May 28 targeting Big Tech companies for discriminating against conservatives and Christians, vowing to end federal support as well as liability protections for the Deep State-controlled firms if they continue silencing viewpoints their bosses disagree with.



Written by [Staff](#) on June 22, 2020

Published in the June 22, 2020 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 36, No. 12

Trump's new policy, known simply as "Executive Order on Preventing Online Censorship," does not impose any new restrictions or mandates on the companies in question. Instead, it targets federal benefits that have long been offered to the giant Deep State companies. In particular, the order calls on various federal agencies and departments to revisit the broad protections offered for social-media and other tech firms under section 230 of the Communications Decency Act (CDA) exempting them from liability if they act as neutral platforms.

As virtually everybody knows now, the Big Tech companies dropped everything but the pretense of neutrality many years ago. That process accelerated amid and after the 2016 election, with multiple individuals and organizations, such as Alex Jones' Infowars, being completely deplatformed. Instead of neutrality, Trump said, the Big Tech firms were engaged in "inappropriate political activism" and were seeking to rig the upcoming election in favor of Democrats. It would not be the first time the Deep State-controlled firms would try to tip the electoral scales, as top experts in the field such as Dr. Robert Epstein and multiple whistleblowers have pointed out over the years.

"Section 230 was not intended to allow a handful of companies to grow into titans controlling vital avenues for our national discourse under the guise of promoting open forums for debate, and then to provide those behemoths blanket immunity when they use their power to censor content and silence viewpoints that they dislike," Trump declared in his executive decree. "When an interactive computer service provider removes or restricts access to content and its actions do not meet the criteria of subparagraph (c)(2)(A), it is engaged in editorial conduct," and therefore acting as a publisher rather than a neutral platform.



Written by [Staff](#) on June 22, 2020

Published in the June 22, 2020 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 36, 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.