



Social-media Attacks on Unapproved Speech Drives Millions to Alternative Platforms

Voter fraud in the United States is real. It has always has been. But today's social-media overlords will not allow that sort of talk.

The mainstream argument says there's never enough fraud to sway a presidential election, and anyone who says otherwise is spreading "misinformation." While elections have been, for the most part, historically secure, there have been notable exceptions. There's reliable documentation that at least one U.S. president won by fraud.

The New American

Author: [Paul Dragu](#)

Date: November 17, 2020



John F. Kennedy's scandalous 1960 election was a result of his familial ties to the mob, who helped secure Illinois and thereby JFK's win in the close 1960 general election. *New York Times* investigative reporter Seymour Hersh explained how this happened in his best-selling book *The Dark Side of Camelot*.

"Contrary to the claims of many liberals, the problem of voter fraud is as old as the country itself," the [Heritage Foundation says](#), noting that there are nine main types of election fraud: impersonation fraud at the polls, false registrations, duplicate voting, fraudulent use of absentee ballots, buying votes, illegal "assistance" at the polls, ineligible voting, altering the vote count, and ballot petition fraud.

Despite no major election ever being conducted without some semblance of fraud, despite well-documented evidence suggesting at least one stolen presidential election, and despite a mountain of fraud allegations in the 2020 presidential election by credible sources, the land's social-media rulers — the self-appointed gatekeepers of information — have all but banned such talk.

{modulepos inner_text_ad}

Last week, *TNA* published an interview by Senior Editor William Jasper with Lieutenant General Thomas G. McInerney (USAF, retired). The general [warned that if the stealing of the 2020 election is not exposed and overturned, we will never see another free election in America](#). McInerney, a highly decorated Vietnam War fighter pilot and top USAF/NORAD commander and DOD official, discussed the criminal use of the secret Hammer-Scorecard program by members of the Obama administration (including former Director of National Intelligence James Clapper, former CIA Director John Brennan, and former FBI Director James Comey) to throw U.S. elections, and suggested it happened in the 2020 election as well.

JBS shared the interview on its Facebook page. The interview spread like wildfire, and after reaching half a million people just on Facebook, the social-media giant slapped a "False Information" tag on it. It also provided a link to a fact-checking article, aiming to show readers why it was false.

One of the points the "fact-checking" article makes is that the premise of Hammer-Scorecard depends on votes passing through "transfer points." It cites a computer science professor at the University of Iowa, who said of the transfer points, "that's not the way the system works." At least in most states, anyway, he clarifies. The expert doesn't mention which states do use transfer points. He also said that "interfering with election results at 'transfer points' would be unlikely."

Unlikely. The "fact-checking" article uses this word repeatedly.

The article also cites Chris Krebs, director of the Department of Homeland Security's Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, who dubs the Hammer and Scorecard theory "nonsense."

Like McInerney, Krebs is considered a credible source, so, it's one credible source's word against another's.

Social-media gatekeepers had no problem with allowing voices from both sides to post on their platforms during the Russia Collusion hysteria. Facebook and Twitter allowed every legacy media outlet to parrot the idea that Trump colluded with the Russians to win the 2016 election. A lot of them presented it as fact, casting aside any pretenses of journalistic objectivism. On one side of the Russia Collusion story, you had former intelligence agency voices saying collusion existed. On the other side, the Trump administration and conservative alternative media outlets were saying that was false. And it was all allowed. No false labels for either side.

But not anymore.

Now these platform giants, whose expertise has nothing to do with gathering and publishing news, have become

The New American

Author: [Paul Dragu](#)

Date: November 17, 2020



experts on the matter by choosing which experts are right. (It seems as if they've become epidemiologists and climate scientists as well.)

On Friday, Facebook notified The John Birch Society, the parent organization of *The New American*, that the organization's page has been banned from advertising and its content will have "reduced distribution and other restrictions because of repeated sharing of false news." JBS apparently broke the rules of approved speech by reporting on the possibility of voter fraud in the 2020 election. The violations "ticket" also cited, among other infractions, JBS publishing stories suggesting, based on CDC information, that most people who reportedly died of COVID didn't die of COVID alone.

The above story about JBS and *TNA* serves as just one example of how Facebook and Twitter have been censoring and purging people and news outlets based on their flavor-of-the-day speech rules. In response, people have flocked by the millions to other platforms touted as bastions of free speech. On Sunday, the [Wall Street Journal published the story](#), "Parler Makes Play for Conservatives Mad at Facebook, Twitter."

The "libertarian-leaning social network" was the most downloaded app on Android and Apple devices for most of last week, *WSJ* reported. Parler co-founder Rebekah Mercer said she and her partner "started Parler to provide a neutral platform for free speech, as our founders intended." Parler is an answer to the "ever increasing tyranny and hubris of our tech overlords," *WSJ* reports Mercer as saying, adding that the company has more than doubled its user base to 10 million in under a week.

Other popular social-media platforms taking in refugees are Bitchute and Rumble, alternative video platforms to YouTube; MeWe; and Gab, the self-proclaimed "home of free speech online." MeWe was founded by entrepreneur and privacy advocate Mark Weinstein, "a cheerful, loquacious man and a self-identified libertarian," according to *Rolling Stone*.

The purveyors of media virtue have already made sure to warn the public about the dangers of the cyber refugees fleeing social-media persecution.

On November 12, for instance, the left-wing publication *Vice* [published an article](#) titled "Parler, Gab, MeWe, and Rumble Are Creating a Massive Right-Wing Echo Chamber" with the subhead, "Here's why that's dangerous." The writer, David Gilbert, wastes no time telling readers his brilliant analysis.

"And while these networks don't pose a danger to the dominance of the mainstream platforms, their growing numbers are creating a right-wing echo chamber where users are exposed to more extremist views and the possibility of being further radicalized," Gilbert writes.

Gilbert doesn't mention the echo chambers Facebook and Twitter are creating with their stringent speech rules. For him, "the reality is that the platforms are simply labeling misleading posts." Reporting on the possibility of voter fraud, a proven reality, is "misinformation."

JBS and *TNA* are taking steps to ensure that crucial information gets out to the public. JBS has opened accounts with [Parler](#), [MeWe](#), and [Gab](#), while *TNA* now has [Parler](#), [Bitchute](#), and [Rumble](#) accounts.