


A big part of the reason Weinstein was finally exposed is that the Clinton machine is falling apart and Harvey is an example to other DNC oligarch manipulators (infowars.com)

by GizaDog to news (+3|-1)

discuss

Lawsuit Outs Democrat Party Laundering Clinton Campaign Dirty Donations

Illegal millions came in. Every cent went back out clean.



by Mark Megahan

784 SHARE



SHARE ON FACEBOOK

The scheme allowed wealthy Democrats to “make massively excessive contributions through straw entities on paper in order to deliver them to control.”

Maine’s Democratic Party illegally conspired with 32 other branches to break election finance laws, by unlawfully funneling into Hillary Clinton’s presidential campaign. The dirty donations

wired to state parties, then instantly transferred straight back to the [National Committee](#) headquarters. Every cent came back clean, starched and neatly pressed, according to a new lawsuit in

“That makes this entire money laundering operation a scheme to circumvent base contribution limits,” attorney [Dan Backer](#) now alleges that the plot [allowed](#) wealthy Democrats to “make massively excess contributions through straw entities on paper in order to [deliberately](#) put Hillary Clinton’s control.” That isn’t good. According to Backer, it is exceedingly illegal to have done so.”

Backer’s most recent suit, filed in Maine, goes beyond his earlier suit by bypassing the [Federal Elections Commission](#) entirely to hold the [Democratic Committee](#) directly responsible. The suit is expected to put the heat on the FEC at the same time, through the added pressure of a state court.

Backer first made headlines in December by filing a formal complaint with the FEC outlining the details of what he uncovered. After months of waiting without a response, he filed suit against the FEC in a Washington federal court.

Backer is hoping to compel the agency which investigates and enforces laws related to political fundraising to actually do their jobs and



the Democratic state committees.

In an interview with [Maine Public Radio](#) about the most recent election, he explained how the Maine Democrats conspired with Hillary Clinton to exploit rules that allow state party committees to transfer unspent money between one another.”

Because huge wire transfers to and from the national campaign and state level branches aren’t scrutinized, the Democrats were able to “circumvent individual donor limits and funnel the cash back to the principal campaign committee.”

It is obvious that the whole thing was a smoke and mirrors ruse because “the state committees never had custody of the money.”

During the 2016 campaign, the joint fundraising committee “[Fund](#)” went around to big donors asking for big checks. Under the rules, a donor can bundle up the maximum allowable contribution, for any possible candidate they can donate to, in one single check.

Theoretically, the money is meant to benefit all of the candidates as if each donation were made one-by-one. Legally, anyone can donate up to \$2,700 to any individual candidate.

Not only that, they can donate \$10,000 all at once to every : another \$33,400 to a national party.

Everyone involved “should be worried,” Backer warns. “The at significant legal jeopardy.”

Along with Democratic party officials, there are quite a few t the hot seat. [Steven Spielberg](#), [Calvin Klein](#), even Facebook [Sandburg](#) all made questionably large bundled donations.

HVF held dinners at [George Clooney’s](#) house, and concerts [John](#), where Democratic-leaning donors could write one co figure check and HVF would handle the details. Some stars than \$400,000.

What really happened is that all of it went directly to Hillary (campaign.

Early in 2016, the [Maine Center for Public Interest Reporting](#) evidence that “the money the party received from big donor immediately transferred to the Democratic National Commit

When it goes out as fast as it comes in, how could it be “use

“The quick transfers raise questions about the state commit participation in the joint fundraising agreement, which are bi arrangements that mutually benefit its participants. Yet little donated to the [Maine Democratic Party](#) stayed there.”

Their reporting was backed up by FEC transaction records.

One shady transaction showed how \$3 million went from th Fund to the Maine Democratic Party. Almost immediately, 2 right back out to the DNC. “It’s unclear how the leftover mor

In another Maine transaction, “transaction data showed the a \$15,000 donation to the DNC before it arrived from the Hi Fund.”

Backer explains the significance of these exchanges as “the papered to make it look like it passed through state commit

“On the very same day each of these transfers supposedly occasionally the very next day, every single one of those st: purportedly contributed all of those funds to the DNC,” the f alleges.

Attorney Paul Ryan and his [Common Cause](#) “finance transp has gone toe-to-toe with Backer in the past but this time agi the Democrats were up to was wrong.

“There’s a lot of smoke here. There may be a fire,” he told k news media. “There may be some actual violations of feder finance law.”

“At a bare minimum,” he insists, “the FEC needs to open ar

While Ryan agrees there was wrongdoing, he says that foc transactions misses a bigger infraction. He notes that [Donn Brazile](#) admitted publicly in her book that while she was chai DNC was basically run from Clinton’s campaign headquarte

To Ryan, that means that Hillary Clinton was controlling the me, that looks like illegal or coordinated spending,” he decla

All these shenanigans are something that the [Department c](#) also be looking at Becker points out. What the Democrats d times the magnitude” of the [Dinesh D’Souza](#) case. He was 2012 for “a strawman donor scheme.”

HARVEY WEINSTEIN AND THE CLINTON PROTECTION RACKET

Harvey Weinstein's recent perp walk reminds me of another great thing about Trump winning the election: Hillary Clinton isn't president.

A New York Times article on Weinstein's court appearance noted how the "ground" was finally ending the "code of silence" surrounding powerful men. Why "last year," if it's been that way for decades?

The article explained that Weinstein's power was enormous, his connections extensive, and he was able to play dirty without bounds. Did Harvey lose his money and connections "last year"?

Nope. But "last year" was the first year of Trump's presidency, or as I like to think of it, the year Hillary was not being president. Ever.

The liberal protection racket for sexual predators was always intimately intertwined with the Clinton model. The template used to defend Bill Clinton became a model for all left-wing sexual predators. They hired the same lawyers and detectives and counted on the same cultural elites to make sure no one stood in the way of their Caligula lifestyles. It was Total War against the #MeToo movement.

Even Teddy Kennedy never plotted revenge on reporters or smeared his sexual conduct with trailer park trash and stalkers. That was the Clinton model.

Showing how incestuous it was, in 2000 -- two years after Clinton's impeachment -- a publishing company, Talk/Miramax, overseen by Tina Brown, took revenge on Clinton's impeachment.

The publishing house commissioned a book by John Connolly to dig into the private lives of the people who had helped expose Bill Clinton, e.g., the lawyers behind Paula Jones' lawsuit, Linda Tripp lawyer Jim Moody, Matt Drudge, reporter Michael Isikoff and so on.

Concise summary of the book: All of us were gay, except me, because I was having an affair with Geraldo Rivera.

We know this because drafts of the book, "The Insane Clown Posse," soon began to circulate. Editor-in-chief Jonathan Burnham denied that any private eyes had been prying into the book, but he'd kill the book if it were true.

I went on "Rivera Live" and produced a letter given to me by an ex-boyfriend from

for dirt on me:

"My office has been engaged by John C. Connolly, a writer who has performed work for Premiere, Vanity Fair and a few other magazines. The project for which my service was with January 16th, 1998, the day Monica Lewinsky was corralled by the office of the counsel. Mr. Connolly has described the goal as 'a day in the life of'-type book, and me to conduct interviews and look into the background and activities of a few people including the author of 'High Crimes and Misdemeanors,' one Ann Coulter.

"Nils B. Grevillius, private investigator"

As a result, the book was killed. But what if my ex hadn't given me that letter?

No one cared about any of our private lives. The only point was to humiliate anyone Clinton's treatment of women as his sexual playthings.

There were plenty who did.

Well into the Monica Lewinsky scandal -- which followed the Jennifer Flowers scandal, the Dolly Kyle Browning scandal, the Elizabeth Ward Gracen scandal, the and the Kathleen Willey scandal -- feminist icon Gloria Steinem wrote her infamous ed, announcing the "One Free Grope" rule for progressive men.

"He takes no for an answer," Steinem explained. Whether he was groping Kathleen Office or dropping his pants for Paula Jones in the Excelsior Hotel, she said, Clinton rejection."

Soon thereafter, we found out about Juanita Broadrick.

As Bob Herbert wrote in The New York Times, the reaction of the feminists to Clinton behavior "can most charitably be described as restrained." (This was when the Times occasionally serious newspaper.)

Not one Senate Democrat voted to remove Clinton from office for various felonies and assaults.

The message was clear. Liberal men got a pass for any sexual misconduct, even rape who accused them. (Even last year, NBC News was still following the old rule: It first rather than publish his Weinstein expose.)

Liberal males treated progressive politics like carbon credits for rape. Last year, MSNBC reported that Democratic sexual predators on Capitol Hill say, "I can't be sexist; I'm

Recall that Weinstein's reaction to the accusations against him was to say: "I've decided to give the NRA my full attention. I hope Wayne LaPierre will enjoy his retirement party at the same place I had my Bar Mitzvah."

It's hard to avoid the impression that a big part of the reason Weinstein was finally

Clinton machine is dead. Trump killed it. Would anyone have called out Weinstein if Hillary Clinton were "Madame President"? I doubt it. The Clinton protection racket and on and on.

After years of feminists excusing sexual predators, once the Clintons were out of the White House there was no reason to keep humiliating themselves by defending the indefensible.

The Worst Generation has flatlined. There are no more Clintons to save. But as absolute as I am of the Clintons' demise, I'd feel a lot better if someone would keep them handy.