



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on December 10, 2020

## Google Helped Sway Election; Now Subsidiary YouTube Will Delete Vids Claiming Election Was Rigged

It's the best government Big Tech can buy. Fresh off shifting millions of votes to Democrats via manipulation and helping determine the election, tech companies now want to determine what can be said about it. In particular, YouTube has just announced that it will delete videos (much as Trump votes were deleted?) that question the 2020 contest's legitimacy.

"Yesterday was the safe harbor deadline for the U.S. Presidential election and enough states have certified their election results to determine a President-elect," the Google subsidiary [announced](#) in a blog post. "Given that, we will start removing any piece of content uploaded today (or anytime after) that misleads people by alleging that widespread fraud or errors changed the outcome of the 2020 U.S. Presidential election, in line with our approach towards historical U.S. Presidential elections. For example, we will remove videos claiming that a Presidential candidate won the election due to widespread software glitches or counting errors. We will begin enforcing this policy today, and will ramp up in the weeks to come. As always, news coverage and commentary on these issues can remain on our site if there's sufficient [education](#), [documentary](#), [scientific](#) or [artistic](#) context."



Image: BigNazik / iStock / Getty Images Plus

Now, Big Tech just wants to protect you from divisive misinformation, you see — for your own good. Except, of course, when the misinformation was unfounded claims that Russia helped steal the election for President Trump, videos about which were posted over and over, year after year, unrelentingly.

YouTube's statement is curious. The election either was or wasn't legitimate, and state "certification" has no bearing on this matter's reality. So if the election and such censorship were legitimate, the latter should have preceded certification; if the election wasn't legitimate, then there's no justification for such censorship even now.

Of course, Big Tech could claim that since Joe Biden's victory is a *fait accompli* (supposedly), further debate about it merely serves to sow division and should therefore be discouraged. The problem is that



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on December 10, 2020

---

GoogTwitFace (and YouTube) obviously believes that some divisive stories are more equal than others — even when they're lies.

What was Big Tech doing, for example, when Black Lives Matter used platforms to foment unrest by spreading the lie that the police were unjustly targeting black people? What did GoogTwitFace have to say about the general propaganda militating in favor of riots and looting? No deletions there.

Then there's the aforementioned 2016-election claim. "Hundreds of videos remain published on YouTube by the same outlets explicitly promoted by the company pushing the Russiagate narrative, the debunked conspiracy peddled by Democrats since before Trump even took office," [reports](#) the Federalist.

"While a special counsel investigation conducted for more than two years by Robert Mueller should have put the claims to rest, legacy media, and therefore our Silicon Valley overlords, have kept the story alive," the site continues.

Next there's the fantasy that Trump was rigging the election via the Post Office, "another Democrat conspiracy that made the rounds on YouTube," and the theory that "9/11 was an inside job," writes the Federalist.

So does anyone believe Big Tech really cares about what's true or divisive? It sure didn't when it suppressed the Hunter Biden laptop story or all the information enabling it to, [according to a researcher](#), shift up to 15 million votes during an election. The only division GoogTwitFace cares about is the kind dividing leftists from power.

It wasn't always this way. "I'm old enough to remember when YouTube posed an existential threat to information gatekeepers," conservative author Michelle Malkin [told](#) CNSNews. "At its birth, social media held incredible potential to empower dissenters and disrupters of all kinds. Any video creator, no matter how small, could change minds and change the world with peacefully expressed content."

But no more. "Google's video propaganda arm has removed the 'You' from 'YouTube,'" Malkin laments. This is just as how, as I've long said, the "social" has been removed from "social media."

That is, it was "social" because the people determined what was popular, but now Facebook, Twitter, and other entities act as publishers, making editorial decisions about what information will be prominent (or seen at all).

Likewise, Google is no longer truly a search engine. For instead of presenting results most directly related to your search terms, Google now factors in "truth content" — as determined by the tech giant's resident moral relativists.

Some will say, "So what? These are private companies; let the buyer beware." But it's not that simple. Under the Communications Decency Act of 1996's section 230, Big Tech was given immunity from liability — that avowed publishers such as *The New American* don't enjoy — predicated on the assumption that it would provide *neutral platforms*. Big Tech has violated this standard.

Making note of this and prescribing a course of action, Senator Josh Hawley tweeted yesterday:

.@Google owned @YouTube officially announcing free speech no longer allowed. If you have concerns about election integrity, you must sit down and shut up. Repeal Section 230 and break these companies up <https://t.co/EfBfCZHv2>



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on December 10, 2020

---

— Josh Hawley (@HawleyMO) [December 9, 2020](#)

Then there's the allegation that Big Tech has violated Federal Election Commission regulations. Civil-rights attorney Harmeet Dhillon leveled this charge, at Facebook, yesterday on *Tucker Carlson Tonight* (video below — well worth watching).

What I find particularly distasteful, however, is the dishonesty. If Big Tech wants to act as a publisher, fine; it should say so. If it wants to exclude conservatives from its services, fine; it should say so — and then be treated like *any other publisher*.

Instead, GoogTwitFace wants to have its cake and eat it, too, as it masquerades as something it's not, games our system, gets rich, and [chooses our leaders](#) so it can perpetuate its scam. Oh, and let's not forget that as tech companies value signal and engage in woke sermonizing, some then [pander to the tyrannical](#) Chinese regime — when they're not [actually helping](#) Beijing oppress its own people.

GoogTwitFace is a frightful entity — and no friend of humanity.



## 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.



### 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.

**Subscribe**