

Jill Stein's Vote-Recounts Aim for a Hillary Clinton Victory

By [Eric Zuesse](#)

Global Research, November 30, 2016

[Strategic Culture Foundation](#) 30 November 2016

Region: [USA](#)

In-depth Report: [U.S. Elections](#)

Prior to the U.S. election, Hillary Clinton's campaign, and the Obama White House, were saying that Russia's President Vladimir Putin was aiming to make Americans distrust the results of the November election. Of course, at that time, Clinton was considered almost certain to win.

Here was a typical piece of their campaign-propaganda at that time — the time when the expectation was that if there would be any challenge to the election-results, it would be coming from Trump, not from Clinton:



However, after Clinton turned out to be the loser in the election's initial results, the face on that magazine-cover ought to be Jill Stein's, instead of Vladimir Putin's, because Stein is actually the person who turns out to be the prime mover in the attempt to discredit the initial outcome of November's election.

The Clinton campaign is now joining Jill Stein's effort to switch the results in three states — Wisconsin, Michigan, and Pennsylvania — that barely went for Trump in the vote-count (Stein is ignoring to have vote-recounts in the states that Hillary had barely won: New Hampshire, Minnesota, and Nevada; so, this is hardly a non-partisan operation).

Furthermore, an article by Steve Rosenfeld at the anti-Russian website altnet headlined on November 26th, [«Green Recount Effort Poised to Explore Whether Russia Hacked the Vote](#)

[for Trump](#): The stakes and lines of inquiry became clearer as the Clinton campaign joined the effort». This fascinating report from a different anti-Russian propaganda site, indicates that «the first recount petition filed by the Greens, in Wisconsin, primarily focused on Russian hacking, not on the more easily understood line of inquiry of different voting technologies reporting different margins of victory for Trump despite their locations».

Rosenfeld supported that line of attack against a Trump win, citing as evidence for it [an article at the anti-Russian website Medium](#), by an anti-Russian computer scientist at the University of Michigan, who argued that Russia possessed both the capacity and the will to throw the election to Trump. That professor cited as his sources other anti-Russian entities, such as the Obama Administration, and the rabidly anti-Russian Ukrainian regime that Obama had installed in a bloody coup (fronted by '[democracy protesters](#)') [in Kiev during February 2014](#) (and which even a CIA-friendly American intelligence-expert called [«the most blatant coup in history»](#)). The Michigan anti-Russian professor said:

«Federal agencies [publicly asserted](#) that senior officials in the Russian government commissioned these [attacks](#). Russia has sophisticated cyber-offensive capabilities, and has shown a willingness to use them to hack elections. In 2014, during the presidential [election in Ukraine](#), attackers linked to Russia sabotaged the country's vote-counting infrastructure and, according to published reports, Ukrainian officials succeeded only at the last minute in defusing vote-stealing malware that was primed to cause the wrong winner to be announced».

(Where that anti-Russian professor linked [«election in Ukraine»](#), the source linked-to was the anti-Russian Christian Science Monitor, headlining in June 2014, «Ukraine election narrowly avoided 'wanton destruction' from hackers (+video): A brazen three-pronged cyber-attack against last month's Ukrainian presidential elections has set the world on notice – and bears Russian fingerprints, some say». The [«Russian fingerprints»](#) that were actually identified in that article, however, were not at all the Russian government, but «pro-Russia hackers, [who] infiltrated Ukraine's central election computers and deleted key files, rendering the vote-tallying system inoperable», and who promptly posted online «spilling e-mails and other documents onto the web», which hardly seems like the sort of surreptitious election-manipulation operation that the professor, and Clinton, and Stein, are allegedly trying to document to have occurred in the Trump-Clinton electoral contest.)

So, all of that professor's sources were anti-Russian and accepted U.S.-government propaganda without question — and furthermore cited sources as being evidence for hypotheses that they didn't *actually* support.

Rosenfeld's article noted that that professor's article had prompted «the Clinton campaign's top lawyer, Marc Elias» to seek a recount in the three states that in the initial counts had barely tipped to Trump: Michigan, Wisconsin, and Pennsylvania. And, coincidentally Jill Stein had already been seeking funding to do precisely that; so, the Clinton campaign was now conveniently jumping aboard her bus (if it wasn't actually Clinton's bus from the very start — and funded by Clinton's billionaires).

Both [CNN](#) and the 'alternative news' site [altnet](#), and other 'news' sites, quoted the Clinton campaign's lawyer, Elias, who wrote [at Medium](#), that, «just yesterday, the *Washington Post* reported that the Russian government was behind much of the 'fake news' propaganda that circulated online in the closing weeks of the election». (Was he referring to the fake

news at sites, and print-publications, such as TIME? No.) On November 27th, I headlined [«The Lying Washington Post Gets Exposed, And All Major U.S. ‘News’ Media Refuse To Report It»](#), and documented, both from my own research and from the research by two reporters at The Intercept, that the Washington Post ‘news’ story cited there by the Clinton lawyer was itself fake ‘news’, an outright lie. Instead of America’s ‘news’ media publicizing the exposing of the hoax by the Washington Post, which had been based upon a hoax started by unnamed persons, America’s ‘news’ media, and the Clinton campaign’s lawyer, were still citing that hoax, by ‘PropOrNot’ and spread virally now by the WP and other U.S.-government fronts, or ‘news’ media, as being their authority.

On November 28th, *TIME* headlined [«What You Need to Know About the Wisconsin Recount»](#), and a sub-headed section there was:

«What is Clinton’s role?

Peripheral. The effort is being led by Stein, who is filing petitions and raising the money necessary to secure the recount in each state. Though Clinton officials have weighed in on some of Trump’s responses, insight into the Clinton camp’s thoughts on the recount was provided by Elias via [Medium](#)».

Subscriptions to the mainstream ‘news’ media have been soaring ever since these medias’ predictions regarding who would almost certainly win the Trump-Clinton electoral contest became disconfirmed by subsequent events. This is like what had happened after those media had told us in 2002 and 2003 that Saddam Hussein must be overthrown because of his [weapons of mass destruction](#). At such times as this, most people seek the assurance of obtaining their information only from [‘the top quality news sources’](#). And, of course, all of those ‘news’ sources validate all of the other ones; so, those are the ones which [benefit the most](#) from the public’s confusions and uncertainties. This is the way [‘democracy’](#) functions. It’s built on trust. (Trust in ‘authority’, of course.)

The original source of this article is [Strategic Culture Foundation](#)
Copyright © [Eric Zuesse](#), [Strategic Culture Foundation](#), 2016

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Eric Zuesse](#)

About the author:

Investigative historian Eric Zuesse is the author, most recently, of *They’re Not Even Close: The Democratic vs. Republican Economic Records, 1910-2010*, and of *CHRIST’S VENTRILOQUISTS: The Event that Created Christianity*.

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