

Electoral Dirty Tricks in Play on Super Tuesday?

By [Stephen Lendman](#)

Global Research, March 04, 2020

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [History](#)

How is it possible for a Dem presidential aspirant ahead in most Super Tuesday states (according to polls), including California and Texas, to lose overall to a challenger?

The latest pre-Super Tuesday polls showed Sanders leading Biden by wide margins in California and Texas with 416 and 228 pledged delegates respectively — according to Real Clear Politics from an average of polls.

They showed Sanders ahead in Virginia, Massachusetts, Maine, Colorado, Utah, and Vermont, his home state.

Sanders was projected to win eight of 14 Super Tuesday states. He won four — California, Vermont, Colorado and Utah, losing Texas to Biden despite a near-9 point lead, according to polls.

Results so far show Biden winning nine states — Virginia, North Carolina, Alabama, Tennessee, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Minnesota, Massachusetts (where he trailed Sanders and Warren in polls), and Texas.

A total of 1,357 Dem delegates were up for grabs in Super Tuesday states, 34% of total elected ones — nearly half the Tuesday total from California and Texas.

After teetering on the edge of elimination from poor showings in Iowa, New Hampshire and Nevada, Biden emerged from Super Tuesday as the Dem frontrunner.

He has 453 elected delegates. Sanders trails with 382, followed by Warren with 50 and Bloomberg with 44.

The only candidate worthy of popular support, Tulsi Gabbard, an anti-war/progressive champion, is virtually eliminated from the race with one delegate.

In her home state Massachusetts, Warren finished third behind Biden and Sanders.

Despite her poor Super Tuesday showing, she vowed not to quit, saying: “I am in this fight.”

Virtually too far behind in the delegate count to catch up, polls in upcoming primaries showing her trailing badly, is she in it for Biden over Sanders in return for favors promised her?

Earlier calling herself “capitalist to the bone,” she’s part of the dirty system, not against it, shown by her voting record, most often along party lines, including for what benefits corporate America and the US imperial agenda.

Time and again she defends the indefensible. Like other undemocratic Dems and Republicans, she considers naked aggression humanitarian intervention and democracy building.

During Israel's preemptive 2014 Gaza war, she supported what demanded condemnation, falsely blaming Hamas for Netanyahu regime high crimes.

She's militantly hostile toward Russia, China, Iran, Syria, Venezuela, and other nations on the US target list for regime change.

She falsely accused Russia of "belligerence)," falsely claimed China "weaponized its economy." She supports illegal US sanctions (economic terrorism) on Iran, Venezuela, North Korea and other targeted nations.

She's an Obama clone with a gender difference, never a people's champion.

If she favored progressive politics over dirty business as usual, she'd drop out of the race and endorse Sanders over Biden and Bloomberg — because she's too far behind in the delegate count to catch up.

Vowing not to quit suggests she supports continuity over peace, equity, justice and the rule of law.

Did Dem party bosses manipulate things for Biden to win big on Super Tuesday?

Did they urge Warren to stay in the race to draw support from voters likely to back Sanders if she drops out?

Will key upcoming primaries be rigged for Biden, a figure assuring continuity — even though Sanders as Dem standard bearer would be more likely to defeat Trump in November?

Do Dem party bosses prefer DJT over Sanders — even though the Vermont senator votes along party lines most often?

US electoral dirty tricks are longstanding. Super Tuesday results suggests they were in play to elevate Biden in the delegate count over Sanders.

Is more of the same likely in upcoming primary contests?

Americans get the best "democracy" monied interests can buy — democracy for privileged few alone, governance of, by and for everyone equitably ruled out throughout US history.

That's the disturbing reality in the current race for the White House — aspirants considered "safe" alone allowed to win.

*

Note to readers: please click the share buttons below. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

Award-winning author Stephen Lendman lives in Chicago. He can be reached at lendmanstephen@sbcglobal.net. He is a Research Associate of the Centre for Research on Globalization (CRG)

His new book as editor and contributor is titled "Flashpoint in Ukraine: US Drive for Hegemony Risks WW III."

<http://www.claritypress.com/LendmanIII.html>

Visit his blog site at sjlendman.blogspot.com.

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Stephen Lendman](#), Global Research, 2020

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Stephen Lendman](#)

About the author:

Stephen Lendman lives in Chicago. He can be reached at lendmanstephen@sbcglobal.net. His new book as editor and contributor is titled "Flashpoint in Ukraine: US Drive for Hegemony Risks WW III."
<http://www.claritypress.com/LendmanIII.html> Visit his blog site at sjlendman.blogspot.com. Listen to cutting-edge discussions with distinguished guests on the Progressive Radio News Hour on the Progressive Radio Network. It airs three times weekly: live on Sundays at 1PM Central time plus two prerecorded archived programs.

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