

How Obama's U.S. Department of Energy Defrauded Americans Out Of Their Life Savings In A Massive Crony Crime Cover-up

By The Commission - A Wikipedia-like public collaborative peer-to-peer news authoring network

If certain politicians are as 'impassioned to serve the public' as they say, then shouldn't they volunteer for office and allow the public to see all of their bank accounts?

Of course they will never do that because many of them are getting "[**DARK MONEY**](#)" covert payola and they are in office only to serve criminal kick-back schemes.

Politician's Dianne Feinstein, Barbara Boxer, Nancy Pelosi, Harry Reid and 42 others, sent out letters, emails, meeting requests and pitches to solicit members of the public to join a cause. The top staff of the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) sent out the same pleas. They promised a "wonderful new opportunity for all" in the first market break for outsiders in 30 years.

In meetings, on camera, they promised to give members of the public a fair shot at a group of new Department of Energy funds that Obama had put in place.

They failed to mention one key fact: **ALL OF THE TAXPAYER MONEY HAD ALREADY BEEN SECRETLY PROMISED ("Hard Wired" it is called) TO OBAMA'S, AND THE DOE BOSSES, FRIENDS, IN ADVANCE.**

That is a felony violation of the law. A crime which FBI Director James Comey, and his staff covered up and which DOE Boss Steven Chu and his staff actively implemented. Our team knows this, as fact, because they reported directly to Comey, Chu and their offices.

It was not an '*accident*', it was not an '*oversight*', it was not '*an agency just overwhelmed with paper*'. It was a precision controlled, coordinated organized crime effort designed to **rape**, both, the U.S. taxpayers and the non-crony applicants for these funds.

The crime used the traditional bribes, crony payola contracts, revolving doors, sex worker payoffs and other political corruption but it mainly used a new tactic called "Dark Money".

Our team knows this because some of them were solicited to participate in these crimes and some of them had close personal relationships with the politicians who are now known to have operated these crimes. Some of our witnesses and insiders have been involved with the DOE since before 2000. They have 'seen it all'.

Companies, their executives and their investors were induced by California and New York Senators, White House Staff and the top staff of the U.S. Department of Energy to invest many years of their lives, and tens of millions of dollars of their personal cash in a fake government program which only existed to pay off Obama's political financiers.

American taxpayers were lied to and ruined by the U.S Department of Energy and their damages are increasing monthly. The DOE never apologized, offered fixes or provided anything other than Fusion-GPS kinds of attacks on those who asked for help or who reported the crimes.

This scam happened in 2008. History has proven that the DOE funds, since then, were rigged. Congress, the news media and special investigations have proven that these crimes happened. Nothing has ever been done to help the victims (over 100 companies and over 1800 individuals) recover from their state-sponsored losses.

How does DOE Dark Money work? Let's take a look:

In the [politics of the United States](#), **dark money** is funds given to [nonprofit organizations](#)—and include [501\(c\)\(4\)](#)(social welfare) [501\(c\)\(5\)](#) (unions) and [501\(c\)\(6\)](#) (trade association) groups—that can receive unlimited donations from corporations, individuals, and unions, and spend funds to influence [elections](#), but are not required to disclose their donors.^{[3][4]} Dark money first entered politics with [Buckley v. Valeo](#) (1976) when the [United States Supreme Court](#) laid out [Eight Magic Words](#) that define the difference between electioneering and issue advocacy.

According to the [Center for Responsive Politics](#), "spending by organizations that do not disclose their donors has increased from less than \$5.2 million in 2006 to well over \$300 million in the [2012 presidential cycle](#) and more than \$174 million in the [2014 midterms](#)."^[3] The [New York Times](#) editorial board has opined that the 2014 midterm elections were influenced by "the

greatest wave of secret, special-interest money ever raised in a congressional election."^[5]

The term was first used by the [Sunlight Foundation](#) to describe undisclosed funds that were used during the United States 2010 mid-term election.^{[6][7]} Its practical effect has been described by [Donald Trump](#) as Congress "being under the magical spell of the donors."^[8]

In some elections, dark money groups have surpassed traditional [political action committees](#) (PAC) and "super PACs" (independent-expenditure-only committees) in the volume of spending.^[4] In 2014, the group [Freedom Partners](#) was identified as the "poster child" for the rise of dark money.^[4] In 2012, Freedom Partners had the ninth-highest revenues among all U.S. trade associations which filed tax returns that year, more than "established heavyweights" such as the [American Petroleum Institute](#), [PhRMA](#), and [U.S. Chamber of Commerce](#).^[4] Freedom Partners largely acted as a conduit for campaign spending; of the \$238 million it spent in 2012, 99 percent went to other groups, and Freedom Partners itself did not have any employees.^[4] This was a major distinction between other high-revenue trade associations, which typically have many employees and devote only about 6 percent of spending to grants to outside groups.^[4]

The rise of dark money groups was aided by the U.S. Supreme Court decisions in [FEC v. Wisconsin Right to Life, Inc.](#) (2008) and [Citizens United v. FEC](#) (2010).^[4] In *Citizens United*, the Court ruled (by a 5–4 vote) that corporations and unions could spend unlimited amounts of money to advocate for or against political candidates.^[9]

2010 election cycle

According to the [Center for Responsive Politics](#), dark money (which it defined as funds from outside groups that did not publicly disclose donors, plus groups that received a substantial portion of their contributions from such nondisclosing groups) accounted for nearly 44% of outside spending in the 2010 election cycle.^[10]

In the 2012 election cycle, more than \$308 million in dark money was spent, according to the Center for Responsive Politics.^[11] An estimated 86 percent was spent by conservative groups, 11 percent by liberal groups and 3 percent by other groups.^[11]

The three dark money groups which spent the largest sums were [Karl Rove's American Crossroads/Crossroads GPS](#) (\$71 million), the [Koch brothers' Americans for Prosperity](#) (\$36 million) and the [U.S. Chamber of Commerce](#) (\$35 million), all conservative groups.^{[11][12]} Aside from a complex, and still highly covert network created by The Clinton Foundation, Media Matters and The Podesta Group, the three liberal groups with the largest dark-money expenditures were the [League of Conservation Voters](#) (\$11 million), [Patriot Majority USA](#), a group focusing on public schools and infrastructure (\$7 million), and [Planned Parenthood](#) (almost \$7 million).^[11]

The 2014 election cycle saw the largest amount of dark money ever spent in a congressional election; the *New York Times* editorial board described 2014 "the greatest wave of secret, special-interest money ever."^[5] On the eve of the election, Republican-leaning dark money groups dominated, with \$94.6

million in expenditures, exceeding dark money expenditures by Democratic-leaning dark money groups (\$28.4 million), and by expenditures that could not be classified (\$1.9 million).^[13] Karl Rove's dark money group [Crossroads GPS](#) alone spent over \$47 million in the 2014 election cycle.^[14]

In the Senate elections, dark money spending was highly concentrated in a handful of targeted competitive states, and especially in [Alaska](#), [Arkansas](#), [Colorado](#), [Kentucky](#), and [North Carolina](#).^[15] In the eleven most competitive Senate races, \$342 million was spent by non-party outside groups, significantly more than the \$89 million spent by the political parties.

In the 2014 Kentucky election, a key player was the "Kentucky Opportunity Coalition," a group supporting [Mitch McConnell](#), Republican of Kentucky,^[16] whom the *New York Times* editorial board has described as "the most prominent advocate for unlimited secret campaign spending in Washington."^[5] The Kentucky Opportunity Coalition, a 501(c)(4) "social welfare" group,^[17] raised more than \$21 million, while McConnell raised about \$32 million and McConnell's opponent, Democratic candidate [Alison Lundergan Grimes](#), raised about \$19 million.^[17] According to a [Center for Public Integrity](#) analysis of data provided by advertising tracking firm Kantar Media/CMAG, the group ran more than 12,400 television advertisements.^[17] Every Kentucky Opportunity Coalition's television advertisements mentioned either McConnell or Grimes; overall, about 53 percent of the group's ads praised McConnell while the rest were [attack ads](#) against Grimes.^[18] The Kentucky Opportunity Coalition relied heavily on political consultants in Washington, D.C. and Virginia linked to [Karl Rove's](#) Crossroads groups,^[19] and received \$390,000 in a grant from

Crossroads GPS.^[17] Described as "mysterious," the group was listed by a [Post Office box](#),^[17] and the only name formally associated with the group was political operative [J. Scott Jennings](#), a deputy political director in the [George W. Bush administration](#), a worker for McConnell's previous campaigns.^[18] [Melanie Sloan](#) of the watchdog organization [Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington](#) said that the Kentucky Opportunity Coalition was "nothing more than a sham."^[17]

Dark money also played a role in other competitive Senate seats in 2014. In ten competitive Senate seats, the winners had the following in dark-money support, according to an analysis by the [Brennan Center for Justice](#) at [New York University School of Law](#):^[20]

Winning Candidate	Dark Money in Support	Dark Money as % of Nonparty Outside Spending in Support
Thom Tillis (R-NC)	\$22,888,975	81%
Cory Gardner (R-CO)	\$22,529,291	89%
Joni Ernst (R-IA)	\$17,552,085	74%
Mitch McConnell (R-KY)	\$13,920,163	63%
Tom Cotton (R-AR)	\$12,502,284	65%
David Perdue (R-GA)	\$11,098,585	86%
Dan Sullivan (R-AK)	\$10,823,196	85%
Pat Roberts (R-KS)	\$8,454,938	78%
Gary Peters (D-MI)	\$4,226,674	28%
Jeanne Shaheen (D-NH)	\$3,478,039	35%
Total	\$127,475,231	71%

In North Carolina, the pro-Tillis group "Carolina Rising" received nearly all (98.7%) of its funds from Crossroads GPS; the [Center for Responsive Politics](#) highlighted this as an example of how Crossroads GPS, a 501(c)(4) group, "evades limits on political activity through grants" to other 501(c)(4) groups.^{[16][21]} In the 2014 cycle, Crossroads GPS also gave \$5.25 million to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, \$2 million to the American Future Fund, and \$390,000 to the Kentucky Opportunity Coalition.^[21] In total, Crossroads GPS spent more than \$13.6 million on grants to other groups, which it described as being for the purposes of "social welfare."^[21]

In 2014, the Democratic Party-aligned dark money group Patriot Majority USA, a 501(c)(4), spent almost \$13.7 million on "direct and indirect political campaign activities," airing 15,000 television ads in targeted Senate races.^[22] About half of the \$30 raised by the group came from five anonymous donors.^[22] The group was led by Craig Varoga, "a staunch ally" of Senate Minority Leader [Harry Reid](#), Democrat of Nevada.^[22]

In Alaska, [Mark Begich](#) was "one of the few Democratic candidates to come close to receiving as much support from dark money as his Republican opponent."^[15] The pro-Begich Alaska Salmon PAC, funded entirely by the League of Conservation Voters and its Alaska affiliate, spent funds in support of Begich.^[15]

According to the Center for Responsive Politics, by October 2015, \$4.88 million in dark money had already been spent for the 2016 election cycle, "more than 10 times the \$440,000 that was spent at this point during the 2012 cycle."^[11] The money was spent by six groups - five conservative groups (including the U.S. Chamber

of Commerce, which spent \$3 million, and Americans for Prosperity, which spent \$1.5 million) and one liberal group (Planned Parenthood, which spent just under \$75,000).^[11]

According to Richard Skinner of the [Sunlight Foundation](#), "the focus of early dark money being spent in the 2016 cycle" is on competitive U.S. Senate elections and some U.S. House of Representatives races.^[11] However, dark money also is playing a role in the [2016 Republican presidential primaries](#); by June 2015, at least four Republican presidential candidates were raising funds via 501(c)(4) organizations: [Bobby Jindal's America Next](#), [Rick Perry's Americans for Economic Freedom](#), [John Kasich's Balanced Budget Forever](#), and [Jeb Bush's Right to Rise](#).^[23] Comparison to (and relationship with) super PACs [\[edit \]](#) 501(c)

Dark money (501(c)) groups and super PACs compared
(source: [Sunlight Foundation](#)^[24])

	Super PACs	Dark-money groups
Type of entity	Campaign committee (regulated by FEC)	Nonprofit (regulated by IRS)
Disclosure of contributors required?	Yes	No
Disclosure of expenditures required?	Yes	Through tax filings (Form 990s) (Typically delayed by year or more; often submitted long after elections have ended)
Limits on dollar amount of contributions?	None	None
Can be wholly political?	Yes	No (political activity cannot be majority of expenditures)
Coordination with	Impermissible	Impermissible

"dark money" groups are distinct from [super PACs](#).^[25] While both types of entity can raise and spend unlimited sums of money, super PACs "must disclose their donors," while 501(c) groups "must not have politics as their primary purpose but don't have to disclose who gives them money."^[25] However, a single individual or group can create both types of entity and combine their powers, making it difficult to trace the original source of funds.^{[25][26]} [ProPublica](#) explains: "Say some like-minded people form both a Super-PAC and a nonprofit 501(c)(4). Corporations and individuals could then donate as much as they want to the nonprofit, which isn't required to publicly disclose funders. The nonprofit could then donate as much as it wanted to the Super-PAC, which lists the nonprofit's donation but not the original contributors."^[25] In at least one high-profile case, a donor to a super PAC kept his name hidden by using an [LLC](#) formed for the purpose of hiding their personal name.^[27] One super PAC, that originally listed a \$250,000 donation from an LLC that no one could find, led to a subsequent filing where the previously "secret donors" were revealed.^[28]

During the 2016 election cycle, "dark money" contributions via shell LLCs became increasingly common.^[29] The Associated Press, Center for Public Integrity, and Sunlight Foundation all "flagged dozens of donations of anywhere from \$50,000 to \$1 million routed through non-disclosing LLCs to super PACs" backing various presidential candidates, including [Marco Rubio](#), [Hillary Clinton](#), [Ted Cruz](#), [John Kasich](#), [Jeb Bush](#), and [Carly Fiorina](#).^[29] [Bradley A. Smith](#), a former FEC chairman who is now with the [Center for Competitive Politics](#), a group that opposes campaign-finance reform, argues that this practice is not

problematic, writing that "it is possibly the making of a campaign contribution [in the name of another](#)," a violation of existing law.^[30]

According to Kathy Kiely, managing editor of the Sunlight Foundation, "untraceable dark money is a preferred tactic of conservatives, while Democrats tend to use traceable super PACs."^[31]

The first federal law requiring disclosure of campaign contributions, the [Federal Corrupt Practices Act](#), was passed in 1910. By the late 1970s, virtually all states and the federal government required public disclosure of campaign contributions and information on political donors. Most states and the federal government also required public disclosure of information about donors and amounts spent on independent expenditures, that is, expenditures made independently of a candidate's campaign.

In January 2010, at least 38 states and the federal government required [disclosure](#) for all or some independent expenditures or [electioneering](#) communications, for all sponsors.^[32]

Yet despite disclosure rules, it is possible to spend money without voters knowing the identities of donors before the election.^{[33][34]} In federal elections, for example, [political action committees](#) have the option to choose to file reports on a "monthly" or "quarterly" basis.^{[35][36][37]} This allows funds raised by PACs in the final days of the election to be spent and votes cast before the report is due.

In addition to PACs, non-profit groups ranging from Planned

Parenthood to Crossroads may make expenditures in connection with political races. Since these non-profits are not political committees, as defined in the [Federal Election Campaign Act](#), they have few reporting requirements beyond the amounts of their expenditures. They are not required by law to publicly disclose information on their donors. As a result, voters do not know who gave money to these groups. Reports have disclosed instances where non-profits were managed by close associates, former staff, or a candidate's family member, and this has led to concern that the candidates benefiting from their expenditures would be able to know who donated the funds to the non-profit group, but the public would not.^{[38] [39]}

For example, in the 2012 election cycle, one organization, the [National Organization for Marriage](#), or NOM, operated two non-profit arms that received millions in donations from just a few donors. It in turn funded several different [PACs](#). While these PACs had to disclose that NOM contributed the funds, they were not required to disclose who gave money to NOM.^[40]

On March 30, 2012 a U.S. District Court ruled that all groups that spend money on electioneering communications must report all donors that give more than \$1,000.^{[41][42]} However, this ruling was overturned on appeal.^[43]

Legislative and regulatory proposals and debate over dark money According to [Columbia Law School](#)'s Richard Briffault, disclosure of campaign expenditures, contributions, and donors is intended to deter corruption.^[45]

The [Federal Elections Commission](#), which regulates federal

elections, has been unable to control dark money. According to the Center for Public Integrity, FEC commissioners are voting on many fewer enforcement matters than in the past because of "an overtaxed staff and commissioner disagreement."^[12] The IRS (rather than the FEC) is responsible for oversight of 501(c)(4) groups.^[12] The IRS "found itself ill-prepared for the groundswell" of such groups taking and spending unlimited amounts of money for political purposes in the wake of the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* in 2010.^[12] The agency particularly "struggled to identify which organizations appeared to be spending more than the recommended 50 percent of their annual budgets on political activities—and even to define what 'political spending' was."^[12] When the IRS began looking at nonprofit spending, it was [accused of improper targeting](#) in a 2013 controversy.^[12]

"With the FEC and IRS duly sidelined" advocates for disclosure turned to the [Securities and Exchange Commission](#) (SEC); nine academics from universities across the U.S. filed petitioned the SEC in August 2011 for the agency to "develop rules to require public companies to disclose to [shareholders](#) the use of corporate resources for political activities."^[12] The petition received over a million comments in the following month, "a record amount for the SEC, with the overwhelming majority of voters asking for better disclosure."^[12] According to [Lucian Bebchuk](#), a Harvard professor of law, economics, and finance who helped draft the petition, the request had drawn the support of "nearly a dozen senators and more than 40 members of the House."^[12] Under current SEC regulations, [public corporations](#) must file a [Form 8-K](#) report to publicly announce major events of interest to shareholders.^[46] The [Sunlight Foundation](#), a group which advocates for a comprehensive

disclosure regime, has proposed that the 8-K rule should be updated to require that aggregate spending of \$10,000 on political activities (such as monetary contributions, in-kind contributions, and membership dues or other payments to organizations that engage in political activities) should be disclosed and made publicly available via the 8-K system.^[46] In 2015, Republicans in Congress successfully pushed for a [rider](#) in a 2015 [omnibus spending bill](#) that bars the IRS from clarifying the social-welfare tax exemption to combat dark money "from advocacy groups that claim to be social welfare organizations rather than political committees."^[47]

Other provisions in the 2015 bill bar the SEC from requiring corporations to disclose campaign spending to shareholders, and a ban application of the gift tax to nonprofit donors. The Obama administration opposed these provisions, but President Obama eventually acceded to them in December 2015, with the White House declining to comment. The nonpartisan [Campaign Legal Center](#) said in a statement that the dark-money provision ensures "that the door to secret foreign dollars in U.S. elections remains wide open through secret contributions to these ostensibly 'nonpolitical' groups that run campaign ads without any disclosure of their donors."^[47]

The [Center for Competitive Politics](#) (CCP), chaired by former FEC chairman [Bradley A. Smith](#), opposes legislation to require the disclosure of dark-money groups, saying: "Our view is that many people will be driven out of politics if they are forced to disclose their names and their personal information. The purpose of disclosure is to help people monitor the government, not for the government to monitor the people."^[12] The Center for

Competitive Politics views "dark money" as a pejorative term, stating that the phrase "evokes an emotional, fearful reaction" and contending that "many of the statistics published on the topic aim to mislead rather than enlighten."^[48] The CCP maintains that dark money "comprises a very small percentage of total campaign spending," calculating the percent of money spent in federal elections by organizations that did not provide itemized disclosure of their donors as 4.3% in 2012 and 3.7% in 2014.

The U.S. Department of Energy was complicit in the processing of Dark Money payola cycling to Obama's financiers as a 'hand-on' operator of a RICO-class crime.

All of the ruckus with Donald Trump and California/DOE VS. Trump is almost entirely based on West Coast and New York corrupt senators, and their insiders, freaking out about their Dark Money organized crime payola scam coming apart and getting exposed.

There's a reason why David Brock chooses to house an **unregistered Professional Solicitor** in his office to raise money for his conglomerate of Super PACs and non-profits.

Professional Solicitors are required to disclose their active solicitation contracts. Brock wants his unregistered solicitor, the Bonner Group, to keep their client list hidden for a very specific reason.

DAVID BROCK IS LAUNDERING MONEY

David Brock has 7 non-profits, 3 Super PACs, one 527-committee, one LLC, one joint fundraising committee, and one unregistered solicitor crammed into his **office in Washington DC**.

Uncovered records expose a constant flow of money between these organizations.

The Bonner Group, his professional solicitor, works off a commission. *Every time* money gets passed around, Bonner receives a 12.5% cut.

FOLLOW THE MONEY

Nonprofits are required to disclose who they give cash grants to.

But they aren't required to disclose who gave them cash grants.

This weak system of one way verification is being abused by Brock. He's been cycling money between his organizations for years, and the Bonner Group's 12.5% commission gets triggered after every pass.

In 2014, **Media Matters for America** raised \$10,021,188.

The Bonner Group was credited for raising these funds. Media Matters paid them a \$1,147,882 commission.

That same year, Media Matters gave a \$930,000 cash grant to David Brock's **Franklin Education Forum**, an organization that shares office space with Media Matters.



media-matters-grant-to-franklin-education-forum

In 2014, the Franklin Education Forum reported \$994,000 in total contributions. 93.6% of that total came from Media Matters!

Surprisingly, though, the Franklin Education Forum gave full credit to Bonner for raising that money. They paid the fundraiser a \$124,250 commission in 2014!

NOTICE WHAT HAPPENED?

1. David Brock's *Media Matters* gave a \$930,000 cash grant to David Brock's *Franklin Education Forum*
2. David Brock's *Franklin Education Forum* credited *the Bonner Group* for raising those funds, triggering the 12.5% commission
 - David Brock paid *the Bonner Group* a \$124,250 commission to solicit a cash grant ... *from himself!*

IT DOESN'T STOP THERE

After the Franklin Education Forum retained \$869,750, they sent a \$816,224 cash grant to David Brock's *The Franklin Forum*:



franklin-education-forum-grant-to-franklin-forum

Note: The 'Franklin Education Forum' is a 501(c)3, and 'The Franklin Forum' is a 501(c)4. They are not the same company.

Since The Franklin Forum 501(c)4 paid Bonner a commission in **2013**, it's safe to assume fundraiser received a \$102,028 commission in 2014. Unfortunately, it's hard to tell for sure. They still haven't filed their taxes for 2014!

LET'S RECAP

Say, for example, you donate \$1,062,857 to Media Matters for America. This is how David Brock would have used your charitable donation in 2014:

1. **Media Matters** would receive your \$1,062,857 donation
 - **The Bonner Group** would earn a \$132,857 commission
 - **Media Matters** would retain \$930,000
2. Next, **Media Matters** would give what's left of your *entire donation*, \$930,000, to the **Franklin Education Forum**
 - The **Bonner Group** would 'earn' a \$116,250 commission
 - The **Franklin Education Forum** would retain \$813,750
3. The **Franklin Education Forum** would then forward the remaining \$813,750 to **The Franklin Forum**
 - The **Bonner Group** would 'earn' a \$101,718 commission
 - **The Franklin Forum** would retain \$712,031

In the end, Brock's solicitor would have pocketed \$350,825, almost a third of your initial donation! That's a far cry from the advertised 12.5% commission.

As bizarre as that scenario may sound, this is *exactly* what David Brock did in 2014.

HOW CAN WE BE SURE THIS IS INTENTIONAL?

David Brock is the Chairman for each of these organizations!
How could he *not* know what's going on?

He's a hands-on Chairman. According to their tax returns, Brock allocates time, weekly, to his organizations:

- Media Matters: 31.50 hours per week
- Franklin Education Forum: 3 hours per week
- The Franklin Forum: 1 hour per week

Furthermore, the **New York Times** reports that David Brock shares a summer rental in the Hamptons with Mary Pat Bonner, the President of the Bonner Group!

David Brock will have a hard time claiming ignorance on this. These transfers are intentional. He vacations with his solicitor. Case closed.

STILL NOT CONVINCED?

David Brock didn't even bother to give his organizations different phone numbers. *They all share the same phone number!*

same-phone-number

WHAT IF...?

We even located the Bonner Group's **solicitation agreement** with Media Matters on Florida's **Gift Givers' Guide**. Clarification on their commission can be found on page 2:

bonner-contract-snip

In English: Contractually, David Brock has the option to exclude certain contributions from triggering the commission. In spite

of this option, he intentionally chooses to trigger the 12.5% commission for money grants between his organizations.

Note: Yes, we are making the assumption that all of Brock's organizations have the same solicitation agreement with the Bonner Group. Given that his organizations share the same address, board members, and telephone number, we feel it's safe to assume they also share the same solicitation agreement.

THIS BARELY SCRATCHES THE SURFACE

Utilizing public facing tax returns, along with records submitted to the FEC, we mapped out all the significant money transfers from 2014 that took place in Brock's office:

 brock-transfers-2014-part-1

 brock-transfers-2014-part-2

This is all from just one year! No further commentary required.

We understand this may be hard to believe. We first came across this in July, and are still having a hard time wrapping our heads around it.

All of the data referenced in this article originated from publicly accessible sources. Check for yourself – we provided links to the source material in our [article](#) exposing the organizations operating in Brock's office, This data has been sitting out in the open, gathering dust for *years!*

SUMMARY

If it looks like a duck, swims like a duck, and quacks like a duck, then it probably is a duck.

We've spent *months* trying to find some sort of loophole to justify this activity. But there aren't any loopholes. David Brock has something to hide. Just last week, [The Daily Caller](#) reported the following:

"Brock's former long-time live-in boyfriend William Grey (whom Brock has thanked in several of his books) threatened to go to the IRS with damaging information about how Brock was running his Media Matters empire. What did Brock do? He [paid Grey \\$850,000](#) to keep quiet. Brock reportedly had to sell his home in Rehoboth, Delaware to come up with the money. This certainly seems to indicate that Brock was terrified about what the authorities would uncover."

Adding to this, [Fox News](#) reported the following:

"Grey accused Brock of "financial malfeasance" and threatened to undermine Brock's fundraising efforts.

"Next step is I contact all your donors and the IRS," Grey wrote in an email dated May 19, 2010. "This is going to stink for you if you do not resolve this now.""

We believe that the information presented in this article is what has Brock so terrified. We feel confident in saying, with close to

absolute certainty, that **David Brock is laundering money through his Media Matters conglomerate.**

Look at the argument we've been making on The Citizens Audit:

- The 14 organizations stuffed into Brock's office in Washington DC
- The fraudulent tax returns filed by Media Matters for America
- The dirty money flowing into the conglomerate via his unregistered solicitor, the Bonner Group
- The records exposed and analyzed in this article

Adding to this, we can also say, with close to absolute certainty, that David Brock's Media Matters conglomerate is breaking campaign finance law by illegally coordinating with the Clinton Campaign:

- The Clinton Campaign's illegal purchase of research from Brock's Super PAC
- Brock's shadow campaign for Hillary Clinton

We still have a couple articles worth of content to publish, and hope to wrap things up by the end of this week. We will