

Sanders Defeats Rivals in Iowa? Results Delayed

By [Stephen Lendman](#)

Global Research, February 04, 2020

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [History](#)

According to We Are Iowa, early results show Sanders ahead of rivals in the race for the state's 41 Dem delegates.

Addressing supporters Monday night, Sanders slammed Trump, saying "we cannot continue to have a president who is a pathological liar, who is corrupt, who does not understand our constitution, and is trying to divide our people based on the color of their skin, their religion, their sexual orientation, or where they were born."

Iowa caucus results were supposed to be released Monday night.

Instead they were delayed, Politico headlining: " 'It's a total meltdown:' Confusion seizes Iowa as officials struggle to report results."

"The Iowa caucus results appear to be indefinitely delayed, leaving (Dem) candidates in a lurch."

Is the problem "technical," as reported, or something more unseemly?

Are results being manipulated before release to favor party favorites over others, notably Sanders. Polls showed him favored over other Dems.

In 2016, WikiLeaks revelations of thousands of DNC emails showed party support for Hillary, plotting against Sanders, rigging things to make her party nominee.

The process was like holding a world series or super bowl with only one team contesting.

Sanders never had a chance in the race to become Dem presidential nominee in 2016 — DNC/media collusion and other dirty tricks used against him.

Party bosses chose Hillary, primaries rigged to assure her nomination. Will a similar pattern play out this year?

The US money-controlled political process has been rife with fraud and other dirty tricks for time immemorial.

Despite losing to Al Gore in 2000 and John Kerry in 2004, GW Bush served two terms as president — electronic ease and majority Supreme Court justices elevating him to power.

Numerous other examples of a debauched system date from early in the 19th century, modern-day technology enabling things to turn out the way party bosses and deep-pocketed funders wish.

In its Tuesday edition, the Wall Street Journal published Iowa Caucus results from 33 of 1,765 districts, showing Sanders with 27.7% of the vote, Biden with 11.1%.

The Sanders campaign released its own tally from 40% of reporting precincts, showing him ahead of other Dem aspirants with 28% support to Buttigieg's 21%, Warren's 19%, and Biden with 14%.

A final count of districts tabulated had Sanders getting 30% support, Buttigieg 25%, Warren 21%, Biden 12%, and Klobucher 11%.

Biden's poor showing could eliminate him from contention if New Hampshire results next Tuesday are similar.

What caused what Politico called a "technical meltdown in Iowa...a huge black eye" to the state, "set(ing) off bedlam in the" first race for the White House contest?

The NYT blamed it on a "poorly tested...app," citing anonymous sources.

A Washington Post report was similar, saying "caucuses were in a state of suspended confusion — with precincts unable to communicate results."

Dems "began their high-stakes nominating contest Monday under a cloud of uncertainty and dysfunction."

Dem Pottawattamie County chairwoman Linda Nelson couldn't get her mobile app to work. WaPo quoted her posting "HELP" on Facebook.

Noting the "election debacle," the Wall Street Journal said there were "inconsistencies in the reporting."

The Trump campaign called the technical snafu or whatever delayed release of results Monday night as expected "the sloppiest train wreck in history."

Donald Trump Jr mocked what happened, tweeting: "Tomorrow's plot twist 'Hillary Clinton is reported the winner of the Iowa caucus.' "

DJT tweeted: "Big WIN for us in Iowa tonight."

According to Iowa Dem party communications director Mandy McClure:

"We found inconsistencies in the reporting of three sets of results."

"In addition to the tech systems being used to tabulate results, we are also using photos of results and a paper trail to validate that all results match and ensure that we have confidence and accuracy in the numbers we report."

Results are expected Tuesday, greatly diminished by headlined reports of a Monday "technical meltdown."

Whatever the reported outcome, the New Hampshire primary is days away next Tuesday.

*

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.

Featured image is from The Unz Review

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