

American Free Press

VOLUME XVII • NUMBER 25 & 26 • JUNE 19 & 26, 2017 • AMERICANFREEPRESS.NET • POSTMASTER: DO NOT DELAY • MAILED JUNE 16, 2017 • \$3.00

LAWSUIT EXPOSES DNC

• Case against Democratic Party reveals total disregard for rank-and-file

By Sophia Meyer

A lawsuit brought by supporters of Democratic presidential contender Bernie Sanders against the Democratic National Committee (DNC) has revealed the depth of corruption demonstrated by the Democratic Party when it disregarded the will of a great number of its members in promoting Hillary Clinton to the exclusion of Sanders as the presidential nominee. The problem is, few Americans know about this because the mainstream media has so far refused to cover the case.

As the contentious 2016 Democratic presidential primary campaign wore on, supporters of Sanders increasingly suspected the DNC and its chair, Rep. Debbie Wasserman Schultz (D-Fla.), of creating a manufactured win for Mrs. Clinton by promoting her candidacy while sabotaging that of Sanders.

In June 2016, attorneys for 150 Sanders supporters filed a class action lawsuit against the DNC and Mrs. Wasserman Schultz, demanding a jury trial. The suit claims the DNC's actions violate its charter, which "expressly obligates the DNC to maintain a neutral posture with respect to candidates seeking the party's nomination for president during the nominating process."

The suit's merit had been affirmed shortly before it was filed when WikiLeaks published nearly 20,000 emails and other documents, including donor lists, hacked



from key DNC party members, which provided evidence supporters' suspicions were indeed warranted.

Following the leak, party leadership immediately issued a "deep and sincere" public apology to Sanders and his supporters "for the inexcusable remarks made over email," and assured party members, "These comments do not reflect the values of the DNC or our steadfast commitment to neutrality during the nominating process."

Not satisfied with words alone, Sanders supporters filed suit.

Plaintiffs charge that, contrary to the charter, "the DNC was biased in favor of

one candidate—Hillary Clinton—from the beginning and throughout the process. The DNC devoted its considerable resources to supporting Clinton above any of the other Democratic candidates. Through its public claims to being neutral and impartial, the DNC actively concealed its bias from its own donors as well as donors to the campaigns of Clinton's rivals, including Bernie Sanders."

Many readers will no doubt be surprised upon first learning of this year-old news given the mainstream media's near "total blackout" of it, as Jared Beck, lead attorney for the plaintiffs, said in an interview.

The media's anti-Sanders bias is nothing new, however. Despite massive turnout at Sanders rallies and higher contributions to his campaign from small, individual contributors than to any other candidate in U.S. history, mainstream media coverage clearly favored Mrs. Clinton. From the beginning, media marginalized Sanders as "a long shot" and the presumed loser. Analysis conducted by TV News Archive reveals Mrs. Clinton's cable TV coverage was nearly double that given to Sanders.

The week before the Iowa primary election—which Mrs. Clinton won by

0.25%, the slightest margin in history—Associated Press (AP) had declared Mrs. Clinton the "presumptive winner" of the primary. AP based its reporting in part on polling of the extra 716 unpledged delegates, called "superdelegates"—which included Democratic Party leaders and elected officials—who had been appointed by DNC leadership. Clearly, the party was not interested in moving forward the choice of registered Democrats if that choice was not Mrs. Clinton.

It is not surprising, then, that this same media has failed to report on the DNC's shady political maneuvering, as its own unethical, anti-democratic practices would be brought to light were they to accurately cover the lawsuit.

In perhaps one of the more shocking moves, DNC lawyers have filed a new motion to dismiss the suit, claiming that "campaign contributors donated knowing the DNC favored Hillary Clinton," and "Sanders supporters were aware that the primaries were rigged and that neutrality is a political promise that cannot be enforced by a court," reports online news source the "Observer."

DNC lawyer Bruce Spiva argued at the latest hearing on April 25 that the DNC has "no contractual obligation" to follow its charter and has the right to favor a candidate. "It's not a situation where a promise has been made that is an enforceable promise," said Spiva. "We could have voluntarily decided that, 'We're gonna go into back rooms like they used to and smoke cigars and pick the candidate that way.'"

They claim, "neutrality is a political promise and the DNC can do whatever it wants without being legally bound to the charter. The resulting message is that the Democratic Party serves the interests of itself and its wealthy donors and that its voters have no choice but to deal with their totalitarian authority and undemocratic processes," wrote the "Observer."

As the "Observer" points out, regardless of the court's eventual decision on the motion to dismiss, the DNC is now "on record arguing that its voters have no reason to trust it to maintain fair elections." ★