

## 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.



icroseman/ iStock / GettyimagesPlus

## 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.

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. ■



AP Images