

Is the Donald Trumped? Clinton Scheming to Seize White House Through Backdoor

By [Robert Bridge](#)

Global Research, December 04, 2016

[RT](#) 2 December 2016

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Intelligence](#), [Media Disinformation](#)

Next month, Donald J. Trump, with hand on Bible, will be sworn in as the 45th President of the United States. Or will he? The recent talk about recounting votes and 'faithless electors' suggests this highly contentious power struggle is far from over.

In fact, it may be just beginning.

Anybody who believes Hillary Rodham Clinton has been sent to the political graveyard by a Manhattan real estate developer has forgotten the cruel surprises of recent history (Remember the Greek referendum? Brexit anyone?). Democratic due process has devolved into something like *'The Hunger Games'* for the rich - a sensational televised spectacle to entertain the elite every four years, while keeping the people believing they can effect real change.

Although it may seem implausible to some, Donald J. Trump may be denied the presidency due to a democratic system that has been corrupted to the bone by excessive wealth, power and collusion at the highest levels.

[via GIPHY](#)

Countdown to disaster?

As the world media continues to eulogize Cuban leader Fidel Castro, the neocon-liberal establishment is quietly positioning their chess pieces for a power grab of epic proportions. As far as I can tell, there are three stages of this silent coup presently being carried out on behalf of Hillary Clinton.

The first step in the process was to [perpetuate](#) the news that although Donald Trump won the Electoral College (306-232), he failed to win the popular vote - reportedly by 2.5 million votes, at last count.

Clinton's alleged victory in the popular vote count, which [continued](#) for three weeks after Nov. 9 (keep in mind that most of the vote monitors had already gone home as these votes were being quietly tallied), could present serious complications for Trump and his chances of entering the White House, as will become clear a bit later.

Meanwhile, the blatantly anti-Trump media is conducting *"thought experiments"* to show how Clinton would have, could have, should have won the Electoral College if only the

Electoral map had been spliced and diced here and there across the nation. The implicit media message behind all of this tomfoolery, of course, is that [Wall Street-approved](#) Clinton deserves her coronation, because, well, that is what the elite want, democratic procedure be damned.

This ongoing campaign on behalf of Clinton is much more than just sour grapes; in fact, it is a war of attrition designed to exert undue [pressure](#) on the Electoral College, the rickety institution that got Trump elected in the first place. And although it has never robbed an election from a candidate who has gained the majority of Electoral College votes, there is a possibility – and a very high one in this particular battle – of so-called [“faithless electors”](#) tipping this contest in Clinton’s favor.

This represents the second stage of Clinton’s attempt at reversing the results of the presidential election in her favor.

Will the Electoral College go rogue?

The Electoral College is scheduled to meet on [December 19](#) to perform what, under normal circumstances, would be a mere formality of voting for either Clinton or Trump, according to the will of their constituents.

Needless to say, however, we are not dealing with *“normal circumstances.”* This is a battle the Democrats have no intention of losing, no matter what the Electoral College results tell us.

The 2016 presidential campaign represents an epic power struggle that will determine the trajectory of US domestic and foreign policy like no other contest in recent history. No surprise, then, that neo-liberal lobbying groups have been exerting immense pressure on these electors to ignore the will of the people and *“vote their conscience.”*

You’d be very wrong to think this couldn’t work. If 37 Republican electors essentially break the law and vote against Trump, it will block him from winning the presidency. The Democrat’s team of lawyers and political consultants are now [working](#) around the clock to make this happen.

Micheal Baca, a Denver Democrat and a member of the state’s Electoral College delegation, is one of the individuals attempting to persuade Republican electors to discard the will of the people and vote for anybody but Trump.

Baca makes no secret about his intentions to override the Constitution and [go rogue](#).

“This is not about Hillary,” he said. *“This is about trying to stop Donald Trump.”*

The Democrat full-court press is getting results. Art Sisneros, a Texas Republican elector, [confirmed](#) this week that he would resign his position rather than perform his Constitutionally mandated task.

Before continuing, let’s take a moment and perform our own *“thought experiment”* and consider would would happen if Hillary Clinton somehow gets the nod for the presidency instead of Trump. If the country is not completely overwhelmed by coast-to-coast riots and protests, and there is somehow a peaceful transition of power, then Clinton can expect to face four years of the most hostile, uncooperative (Republican) Congress in American

history. Although given the number of neocons who openly support Clinton and her hawkish tendencies, there could be points of agreement.

In a best-case scenario, there would be – aside from carrying out the necessary task of maintaining ‘law and order’ at home, while continuing on a war footing abroad – a four-year-long government shutdown. America would get its first real taste of what martial law feels like.

The American Conservative [painted](#) the following picture as to what would happen if Trump’s Electoral College victory were rescinded: *“Constitutional government would have broken down, and we would be facing something like a Latin American presidential dictatorship. For several years, Washington’s political debate would be reduced to something like a Hobbesian war of all against all.”*

Is that something we really need? Apparently it is for some folks, and not least of all Green Party presidential candidate, Jill Stein.

And this brings us to the final stage of a possible Clinton coup.

Civil War, anyone?

It is generally assumed that it was Jill Stein, the Green Party presidential candidate who masterminded the call for a [recount of votes](#) in Wisconsin, Michigan, and Pennsylvania. That’s not quite right.

New York magazine [reported](#) that on November 17 Hillary Clinton was *“urged by a group of prominent computer scientists and election lawyers to call for a recount in three swing states won by Donald Trump... The group is so far not speaking on the record about their findings and is focused on lobbying the Clinton team in private.”*

Just one day after the above article appeared (Nov. 22), Jill Stein, who came in dead [last](#) with about 3 million votes *less* than Gary ‘What is Aleppo?’ Johnson, announced she would be collecting money to recount votes in the swing states. One of the interesting things about Stein’s choice of swing states to hold recounts is that these are the very same places where Trump emerged victorious. Coincidence or not, that alone should have set off some alarms.

In any case, the reason Jill Stein and not Hillary Clinton is calling for the recount is evident: Throughout the campaign, the media hounded Trump with a single annoying question never asked of the future loser: Would he accept the results of the election in the event he lost? When Trump said he would take a *“wait and see”* approach, Clinton assumed a holier than thou position.

“Now make no mistake,” Clinton solemnly told supporters, *“by doing that, he is threatening our democracy. The peaceful transition of power is one of the things that sets us apart. It’s how we hold our country together no matter who’s in charge.”*

So now that the tables are turned, Stein is in the kitchen doing the dirty work. And the media suddenly can’t get enough of this woman who haunted the 2016 election campaign like a rare phantom sighting.

Here’s how News Busters [tallied](#) her sudden stardom: *“When Jill Stein was the Green Party’s*

candidate for US president, the networks only gave her 36 seconds of coverage. However, as soon as she launched a campaign to contest the presidential election and demand a recount of ballots in several key states, the evening news shows on ABC, CBS and NBC managed to find 7 minutes and 26 seconds of coverage for her in just four days. That's more than 12 times as much coverage as in the entire campaign."

Shame on Donald Trump for objecting to [#Recount2016](#), which makes it even more expensive: <https://t.co/wzH7WifHI>

— Dr. Jill Stein (@DrJillStein) [2 December 2016](#)

But it gets better. Stein has managed to accumulate a massive war chest to carry out the recount - \$7 million at last count (or about seven times what she received during her entire presidential campaign). At one point, her recount drive was pulling in almost \$5,000 every minute. Somehow that doesn't sound like Joe Voter digging deep in his Levi's; that sounds more like big league spenders stepping up to the plate. Incidentally, when Stein first started passing the hat around, she said \$2.5 million would be plenty, thank you very much. Yet every time she hit the target, a [higher threshold](#) was introduced.

Is Stein's recount campaign really about collecting some easy money while giving the Green Party some much-needed attention? Or is Stein just trying to shed some light on the dry rot gnawing away at the foundation of US democracy? All that, however necessary, seems very unlikely. After all, the recount plan was initially floated to Hillary Clinton, not Jill Stein. Thus, we must assume this is all part of a major power push for the Democrats to steal the White House from Donald Trump.

As Paul Joseph Watson [summed](#) up the situation: *"Her entire campaign was backed by an establishment that wouldn't hesitate to exploit a recount to carry out the vote fraud they thought they didn't need on Election Day."*

Exactly.

And here is where we can fit the last piece into the puzzle to understand what is really going on here. If the recount effort alone won't make much of a difference to either Clinton or Stein's chances of overturning the massive edge that Trump now enjoys, then why are they bothering themselves? Hold onto your seats, folks, this gets interesting.

The answer boils down to simple arithmetic, as well as some monkey play in the system.

Presently, Michigan has already agreed to a recount, which will be carried out this weekend and require hand-counting of ballots in the regions. This process will take many days. Federal law requires the recount to be finished by Dec. 13 - just six days before the Electoral College is expected to cast its votes.

Wisconsin has already agreed to a recount, while Pennsylvania is dragging its feet. In other words, this process will probably take us right up to Dec. 19 - the date the Electoral College is supposed to cast their votes (Why the Electoral College vote isn't valid without these voters, who could go rogue, is a question for another day).

Keep in mind that the total number of Electoral College Votes in Wisconsin, Michigan, and Pennsylvania equals 46. Now take Trump's 306 Electoral votes and subtract that amount.

This leaves you with 260, which is below the 270 required for a candidate to be automatically considered the winner of a presidential election. Do you see where this is going?

Now if this recount should start to point toward a Clinton victory in these three swing states, this will present Trump with a very serious quandary. Should he kick up a fuss and protest the recount on the grounds that he won the Electoral College, this could provoke some sort of “*constitutional crisis*” that prevents the recount from being completed by the Dec. 13 deadline.

[via GIPHY](#)

Now, if the matter remains unsettled by Dec. 19 this could – technically speaking – give the Electoral College’s “*faithless electors*” yet more reason for not aligning themselves with their constituents. Or, on the other hand, the Wisconsin, Michigan and Pennsylvania votes could be considered forfeited because they failed to resolve the issue by the Dec. 19 deadline.

So if it did come down to this, who do you think will be selected – possibly by the very Supreme Court that Trump hopes to disband once in office – to be the 45th president of the United States?

Yes, Hillary Rodham Clinton, the candidate we have been told got 2.5 million more popular votes than Donald Trump (I would suggest Trump start a serious process to challenge those votes right now).

For those who still doubt this possibility, please consider the two latest failed grassroots movements of our times – [Brexit](#) and the [Greek referendum](#) – two examples of ‘democracy in action’ that the political elite has de facto canceled or put on hold indefinitely.

Such dramatic setbacks, which are becoming the rule rather than the exception, lend credence to Mark Twain’s famous observation that “*If voting made any difference they wouldn’t let us do it.*”

In other words, the elite will always get what they want, regardless how the votes goes.

Clinton seizing the White House through the backdoor would not be the strangest thing to happen in old Washington. Just ask George W. Bush how he got elected president in 2000 by the Supreme Court, not We the People.

Robert Bridge is an American writer and journalist based in Moscow, Russia. His articles have been featured in many publications, including Russia in Global Affairs, The Moscow Times, Lew Rockwell and Global Research. Bridge is the author of the book on corporate power, “Midnight in the American Empire”, which was released in 2013. email: robertvbridge@yahoo.com

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Robert Bridge](#)

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