

The “Fact Check” Scam. Who Checks the “Fact Checkers?”

By [Dr. Paul Craig Roberts](#)

Global Research, November 17, 2022

Region: [Europe](#), [USA](#)

Theme: [Media Disinformation](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the Translate Website button below the author’s name.

To receive Global Research’s Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [Twitter](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

Last Monday I received an email from NewsGuard, “an independent organization that rates and reviews news outlets based on nine apolitical journalistic criteria.”

The analyst asked me to comment on two statements in my columns in which I am accused of “advancing false and unsupported claims.”

One false and unsupported claim is “a March 2022 article titled ‘Ukraine Hosted Illegal US Biowarfare Laboratories,’ repeated Russian and Chinese propaganda about the presence of U.S.-run bioweapons labs in Ukraine, which has been repeatedly debunked by fact-checking organizations and refuted by U.S. government officials.”

The alleged “fact checker’s” claim that I made a false and unsupported claim is incorrect for two reasons. One is the fact that a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request to the Defense Threat Reduction Agency produced official US government documents that state that the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, a component of the U.S. Department of Defense, funded anthrax laboratory activities in a Ukrainian biolab in 2018. The US government’s records also show over \$11 million in funding for the Ukraine biolabs program in 2019. See [this](#).

See also [this](#).

Apparently, it never occurred to the dumbshit “fact checker” that relying on assurances from a proven liar such as the US government is no way to check a fact.

How, “fact checker,” does the government refute its own admission?

Notice also that the “fact checker” thinks that a statement by the Russian government is “unsupported,” but a statement by the US government is considered “supported.” How does this obvious bias serve to verify any fact?

The second reason the “fact checker” is incorrect indicates that the “fact checker” is incapable of understanding that to report what the Russian government claims to have discovered in Ukraine is not misinformation or propaganda. It is correct information *reporting* Russian claims.

What we see here is a “fact checker” who thinks or has been trained to see any report, whether or not endorsed by the reporter, of an item in the “impermissible to be mentioned” category as a “false and unsupported claim.” In other words, all is false except official narratives.

My other “false and unsupported claim” is that 100,000 vote spikes are indications of fraud, a conclusion endorsed by numerous experts.

The “fact checker” alleges that vote spikes “are commonplace and due to the release of large batches of results all at once from solidly Democratic or Republican districts, or from mailed ballots.” What the “fact checker” does not account for is the extreme unlikeliness of a vote dump of 100,000 or more ballots that is all for one candidate, or how votes were mailed in such a way that all Democrat votes arrived in the same delivery. Perhaps it is statistically possible for 100,000 votes to arrive in an unbroken stream all for the same person, but the probability of such an event is far too low to account for the large number of times it throws a close election to a Democrat. Are there that many voting precincts in which not a single Republican voter lives? Republican vote spikes are rare and seem to happen when the algorithm of the voting machines has created an unbelievable margin of Democrat victory and has to be narrowed.

In my opinion, “fact checkers” are unintelligent people devoid of integrity who are hired to support official narratives by stamping out truth and dissenting opinion.

Who checks the “fact checkers?”

There is no reason to trust a “fact checker.”

Anyone can set up a “fact check” site to protect any material or ideological interest from examination.

Note that “fact checkers” appeared only after the official narratives became so blatantly false that they had to be protected from examination. Never before did we have an industry of censors employed to protect official narratives. “Fact checkers” are the true enemies of truth.

*

Note to readers: Please click the share buttons above or below. Follow us on Instagram and Twitter and subscribe to our Telegram Channel. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

Paul Craig Roberts is a renowned author and academic, chairman of The Institute for Political Economy where [this article](#) was originally published. Dr. Roberts was previously associate editor and columnist for The Wall Street Journal. He was Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Economic Policy during the Reagan Administration. He is a regular contributor to Global Research.

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Dr. Paul Craig Roberts](#), Global Research, 2022

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Dr. Paul Craig Roberts](#)

About the author:

Paul Craig Roberts, former Assistant Secretary of the US Treasury and Associate Editor of the Wall Street Journal, has held numerous university appointments. He is a frequent contributor to Global Research. Dr. Roberts can be reached at <http://paulcraigroberts.org>

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca
www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca