

Hillary Clinton Joins Jill Stein in Attempt to Undermine Election Results

By [Joe Lauria](#)

Global Research, November 28, 2016
[The Duran](#) 27 November 2016

Region: [USA](#)

In-depth Report: [Election Fraud in America, U.S. Elections](#)

Marc Elias, the Clinton campaign counsel, [said](#) the campaign decided to take part in the recount to discover whether there was “outside interference” in the election results. He said the campaign had been inundated with messages from Clinton supporters to do “something, anything, to investigate claims that the election results were hacked and altered in a way to disadvantage Secretary Clinton,” particularly in Wisconsin, Michigan, and Pennsylvania.

Donald Trump narrowly beat Democratic candidate Hillary Clinton in Wisconsin, Pennsylvania and in Michigan, where he won by just 11,612 votes, the closest presidential contest in that state’s history.

Clinton would have to win all three states in the recount to receive 276 electoral votes to Trump’s 260. A total of 270 votes are needed to win the presidency. Trump now leads 306 to 232. The electors will vote in their state capitals on December 9. It is not clear if the three recounts would be finished by then.

“This election cycle was unique in the degree of foreign interference witnessed throughout the campaign: the U.S. government concluded that Russian state actors were behind the hacks of the Democratic National Committee and the personal email accounts of Hillary for America campaign officials,” Elias wrote in an online message.

“We have quietly taken a number of steps in the last two weeks to rule in or out any possibility of outside interference in the vote tally in these critical battleground states,” he said.

Elias said that since the day after the election the campaign had lawyers and data scientists “combing over the results to spot anomalies that would suggest a hacked result.”

But because the campaign “had not uncovered any actionable evidence of hacking or outside attempts to alter the voting technology, we had not planned to exercise this option ourselves.” But now that Stein had initiated a recount in Wisconsin, “we intend to participate in order to ensure the process proceeds in a manner that is fair to all sides,” Elias wrote.

Stein’s Cash

Stein has raised \$6 million in just three days to pay for recounts in Wisconsin, Michigan and Pennsylvania. She filed with Wisconsin on Friday, where officials said the recount would soon begin and plans to file in the other states next week.

“If Jill Stein follows through as she has promised and pursues recounts in Pennsylvania and

Michigan, we will take the same approach in those states as well,” Elias said.

There is no evidence of prior coordination between Stein and the Clinton campaign in the recount effort. However, Stein’s call for the recounts in the three states that could reverse the results of the election in Clinton’s favor raised a number of questions about her motives, which she responded to in an online [video](#) and several television interviews.

Stein said she is not activating the recounts to either help Clinton or hurt Trump but to ensure the reliability of the country’s voting systems. She said she did not believe the recount would change the election’s result.

“You wouldn’t get into an airplane and wait for it to crash to decide you need quality assurance and a backup system,” she [told](#) the PBS News Hour.

“Our voting system is no less important and we’re basically calling for a system to verify voting. We shouldn’t have to show there’s been a disaster in order to safeguard a very vulnerable voting system.”

Stein told PBS there is “not a smoking gun here,” but that this was an election “in which we saw hacking all over the place, we saw hacking into the democratic party database and hacking into voter database in Illinois and Arizona and evidence that it was attempted much more broadly.”

In her fundraising appeal on her campaign website Stein was [quoted](#) blaming the hacking on “foreign agents.” A press [release](#) on the same site carried the same quote but without the words “foreign agents.” The first quote was later altered to remove reference to foreign agents. The original can be seen archived [here](#).

During the campaign, Clinton had repeatedly made the accusation that Russian agents were trying to influence the election and had hacked into the Democratic Party data base and the emails of her campaign chairman, John Podesta.

But at his last testimony to Congress as director of national intelligence, James Clapper admitted there was no proof about who was behind the supposed hacks into email accounts of Democratic leaders which proved embarrassing to the Clinton campaign.

Obama-Clinton Split

Asked in the online [video](#) why she chose recounts in the three states won by Trump that could swing the election, Stein said because the results in those states were close. But there were other closely contested states won by Clinton that Stein has not asked to be recounted.

While Stein is keeping the donor list secret, it is unlikely she would have been able to raise so much money in so short a time without the help of Clinton supporters who would not have backed a recount in states Clinton had already won. Stein only raised \$3.5 million for her entire campaign, about half of what has [poured in](#) for the recount.

Stein may have chosen those states knowing she could get Clinton supporters to pay for her fight for electoral integrity without any intention of deliberately helping Clinton. As Stein and

election analysts say, a recount overturning the election result is unlikely.

But with the Clinton campaign now in on the recount evidence of tampering of the election computers by hackers, especially by “foreign agents,” may be useful for the Clinton team in their effort to lobby electors to change their vote.

Clinton supporters have so far apparently made little headway in their efforts to get Republican electors to vote for Clinton instead. Twenty-four states do not legally bind electors to the popular vote in their states.

On Friday, the Obama administration [said](#) that despite fears there was no evidence that Russia or anyone else had hacked the election. An [article](#) in The Hill on Friday said there was a split within the Democratic Party about whether to go for a recount between the Clinton camp which was for it and Obama’s camp, which was not.

Meanwhile, the national Green Party distanced itself from the recount effort led by Stein.

Scott McLarty, the Green Party’s national media coordinator, told me via email on Friday that, “The recount is a project of the Stein/Baraka campaign.”

McLarty said the national party’s steering committee was never asked by Stein to endorse the recount. But he said she asked the committee to act as the financial agent for the flood of donations, which the committee declined to do.

Some Green Party officials have individually supported the recount. But McLarty said on Saturday, “The Green Party of the United States has not taken an official position on the recount yet.” His comment came hours before the Clinton campaign, which had remained silent on Stein’s move, said it would join the effort to recount the votes.

The original source of this article is [The Duran](#)

Copyright © [Joe Lauria](#), [The Duran](#), 2016

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Joe Lauria](#)

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

