

EXHIBIT P

CAPITAL PLAYBOOK


Early-morning email for knowledgeable New Yorkers.

SIGN UP >

LOGIN

CITY HALL | ALBANY | MEDIA | POLICY

Gawker in the fight of its life with Hulk Hogan sex-tape suit



Hulk Hogan. (Evan Agostini/Invision/AP)



By Peter Sterne 9:00 a.m. | Jun. 12 2015 313

Nick Denton is preparing for the biggest fight of his life. The Gawker Media founder and C.E.O.'s opponent: celebrated professional wrestler Hulk Hogan (real name: Terry Bollea), who sued Denton and Gawker in 2012 after the gossip blog published a supercut of his sex tape and refused to take it down. The case has seen numerous twists and turns over the past three years, but it's finally set to come to trial in Pinellas County, Fla.—where Hogan lives—on July 6.

Denton faces a judge and jury who are skeptical of, if not outright hostile to, his blog empire and philosophy of reporting the “story behind the story,” and some inside Gawker say that they expect the company to lose the case. A loss, and an award of even a fraction of the \$100 million Hogan’s attorneys are seeking, could empty the company’s coffers, forcing Denton to either sell the company outright or to hand much of its equity over to deep-pocketed investors.

Denton was frank about the situation in a tense all-hands editorial meeting on June 4 in Gawker’s Nolita headquarters. Denton was his usual charming and irreverent self as he addressed a number of customary challenges facing the company—including issues with the company's content platform, Kinja, and soft display advertising sales. But he was at turns apologetic and defiant when it came time to discuss the lawsuit. Denton warned staff that the legal battle posed a threat to the company’s fundamental operating principles: its longstanding independence from the demands of venture capitalists and

CAPITAL PLAYBOOK

Early-morning email for knowledgeable New Yorkers.

SIGN UP >

MOST POPULAR

- 1 New Gawker will be '20 percent nicer,' Denton tells staff
- 2 Cuomo-de Blasio war expands to new fronts
- 3 Gawker buyout watch
- 4 Capital Playbook: De Blasio's worst friend; NYMag's Cosby cover
- 5 The making of Mark-Viverito's Uber outburst

big-media ownership.

“I have way, way less money than people think!” Denton told his staff. “... I don’t have hundreds of millions of dollars to kind of bail the company out. If we are in an environment with higher business risk and higher legal risk, then the company is going to need somebody with deeper pockets and hopefully principles in order to keep it both commercially viable and editorially viable.”

MORE ON CAPITAL

- **Gawker buyout watch**
- **The 60-second interview: Mike Hadgis, V.P. global revenue, partnerships, Vox Media**
- **P.M. Media Pro: A ‘Times’ mea culpa; New York’ down**

ADVERTISEMENT



The case has its roots in an Oct. 4, 2012 post written by Gawker’s then-editor A.J. Daulerio about Hogan’s 2006 sex tape. By the time Daulerio published the post, it had been seven months since TMZ broke the news about the existence of the sex tape and more than five months since gossip website The Dirty had published grainy screenshots from the video.

The video shows Hogan having sex with Heather Clem—then the wife of his close friend, the shock jock Bubba the Love Sponge Clem—in Bubba’s house. The video also shows Bubba giving his blessing for Hogan and Clem to have sex.

Gawker received a DVD of the 30-minute video and decided to edit it down to a “highlights reel” about a minute and a half long, and published

that along with a long post by Daulerio commenting on the tape and the nature of celebrity sex tapes in general. Hogan had already threatened to sue a number of other websites if they posted the sex tape, and he sued Gawker in federal court on Oct. 15, 2012.

The history of the case is convoluted, to say the least. Hogan initially sued Gawker in federal court, but after a federal judge **denied his motion** for a preliminary injunction (which would have forced Gawker to immediately take down the post while the case was argued in the courts), he dropped the federal case. In December 2012, he added Gawker as a defendant in the state court case that he had already filed against Heather Clem and Bubba Clem. Gawker argued that Hogan was court-shopping and tried to remove the case back to federal court, but a federal judge remanded it back to the state court in March 2013.

In April 2013, a state judge—Judge Pamela Campbell—granted Hogan’s motion for a preliminary injunction, forcing Gawker to take down both the video and Daulerio’s commentary. Gawker took down the video, but not the commentary, and **wrote a post** about the ruling. Gawker also appealed the injunction order and a state appeals court **reversed the injunction** in January 2014 on First Amendment grounds. Gawker then filed a motion to dismiss the case, which was denied, and a motion for summary judgment, which was also denied. Since those motions were denied, the case is set to be argued before a jury in state court later this summer.

There’s a very real possibility that Gawker will lose the jury trial. The jury, drawn from

Hogan's hometown, will likely be more sympathetic to the wrestler than to a Manhattan media gossip blog. Gawker, Denton said, writes for open-minded, media-savvy millennials. The Pinellas County, Fla. jury is not the site's target audience.

Some among Gawker's leadership find it easy to imagine how Hogan's legal team could portray the case—the all-American hero and local celebrity who's just trying to protect his privacy versus the gay European founder of a Manhattan media gossip blog that published pornography for pageviews.

“I hope that somehow we can be charming enough in our writing and on the stand so that they recognize that we might be mean, bitchy Gawker bloggers, run by someone who will probably be portrayed as a New York pornographer and foreigner, but I hope that beyond that, we can make it clear that we're fighting for the truth to hold elites accountable ... whether that light exposes a Florida celebrity having a swingers party invited by the host to have sex with his wife—whether it's that or whether it's the fact that the system is rigged and people can't make it,” Denton said during last week's editorial meeting.

Heather Dietrick, Gawker's president and general counsel, presented a more hopeful view of the case to Capital, and suggested that the Florida jury would be moved by their argument that Hogan had turned his own sex life into a public spectacle long before Gawker published this tape.

“I think as a common-sense matter, they're going to see that, see what he's talked about in the past. He's talked about really, really graphic details of his sex life, again and again and again, including on the shock jock's show,” she said. “These are practical people. I think they're going to see through him and say, ‘Give me a break. Take responsibility for what you did here.’”

“It will be difficult to sell Gawker to them, but also I think he's going to have a really hard time selling his version of the story to them,” she added.

Hogan is certainly a very public person, having written two memoirs and starred in the reality show, “Hogan Knows Best.” He has been particularly open about his sex life. During various appearances on both Bubba's radio show and Howard Stern's radio show, he has discussed: his erection, the size of his penis, where he prefers to ejaculate during sex, how he uses his mustache during sex, the way his wife pleases him in the car, his penchant for rough sex, and more.

If Gawker does lose the jury trial, it is likely to win on appeal. The appeals court, after all, reversed the lower court's preliminary injunction back in January 2014, ruling that both the video and Daulerio's commentary about it were protected by the First Amendment. The problem for Gawker is that it could already be broke by the time the appeals court overturns the jury's decision.

“The \$100 million, obviously—we don't have enough cash on hand, I don't think anybody does, in order to deal with an outcome as extreme as him picking a number out of the air without any particular basis, doing one of those headline-grabbing lawsuits,” Denton told Capital.

Florida law generally requires a party that wants to appeal a monetary judgment to post a bond equal to the judgment plus two years' interest. If the jury found that Hogan was entitled to \$100 million in damages and Gawker was required to post a bond of at least

that amount, the company would not be able to do so without selling itself to a larger company or bringing on outside investors. Even if the jury only awarded Hogan a fraction of that (and Florida courts are known to give high awards) the results for the company would be disastrous.

Denton said that he estimates there's a roughly 1-in-10 chance that Gawker will face "disaster"—meaning that they lose the trial, the jury awards Hogan a large amount in damages, and Gawker is required to put up a bond for the full amount while it appeals the ruling.

"In any one year, there is a risk of a confluence of events, combination of factors, whether it's recession like we faced in 2008, 2009, internal dissension, a flamewar in editorial that blows up the editorial department, or whatever it is—my guess is that the risk in any one year that you have some kind of real disaster that takes you into the unknown is maybe 1 in 50, under normal circumstances," he said. "We're at a heightened risk level. I'd say probably the risk of a disaster this year is 1 in 10. What happens beyond that point, I don't know."

Gawker tolerates a certain level of risk, Denton said, which lets it do things—like publish the Hogan video and then fight the case instead of settling—that other media companies will not.

"The way I look at the whole spectrum, you can't just focus on the worst-case scenario. If you did that, you'd be a coward like most of these media companies that settle, that actually don't exercise their constitutional rights as members of the free press," he said.

One of the main questions at issue in the trial is whether or not Hogan's sex tape was a newsworthy matter of "public concern." Among other things, Hogan is claiming that Gawker violated the tort of "publication of private facts," which prohibits people from publishing private facts about others, even if they are true, unless the facts are related to matters of "public concern."

In their opposition to Gawker's motion for summary judgment, Hogan's legal team argues that the actual sex tape—described in court documents as "footage of Mr. Bollea naked, aroused, and having sex in multiple positions"—is not a matter of public concern, even though Hogan's sex life and infidelity are matters of public concern. They quote a "journalism expert"—Mike Foley, a journalism professor at the University of Florida—who labels Gawker's practices "pornography" and "not journalism." And they argue that there's a crucial distinction between writing about the existence of Hogan's sex tape and actually publishing uncensored excerpts from the tape:

"All those media outlets that covered Mr. Bollea's sex life, including even the *National Enquirer*, at least had the decency not to broadcast the Sex Video or any part of it. All of them understood that while the information relating to the romantic and sexual lives of celebrities may be matters of public concern, the act of publishing secretly-recorded footage of a celebrity naked and having sex in a private bedroom is not a matter of public concern."

Gawker's lawyers, though, argue that the courts do not have the power to decide how Gawker covers the sex tape story. If the topic is newsworthy, then a story about it—even one that includes nude photos or videos—is newsworthy. Dietrick said that courts have ruled this way in the past.

"Once you see that that topic is a matter of public concern," Dietrick said, "the law does

not allow a judge or the plaintiff or the subject of the story to come along with a red pen and say, 'I didn't really like the way you said it here. I didn't like the way you added this source material. I would've done this part differently.' You don't get a line item veto, basically. The journalist has freedom and the organization has freedom to write about that topic as they see fit."

Hogan's lawyers warn that Gawker's interpretation of the law will lead to a dire future in which no one has any privacy and everyone's sex tapes and nude photos are published on Gawker. This is an actual quote from their opposition to Gawker's motion for summary judgment:

"If it were up to the Gawker Defendants, there would be no privacy in America—everyone's secrets would be exposed, the intimate details of their lives would be fully published—and everyone would gather at Gawker to mock, ridicule, and gawk at what previously was confined to private conversations and closed bedroom doors. In other words, if it were up to Gawker, all walls would become windows, and no privacy would exist anywhere."

Denton and Dietrick say that this is not true, and that Gawker's journalists make decisions every day about what is newsworthy and what is not.

"I have a simple editorial litmus test, which is: is it true, and is it interesting?" Denton said. "The interest in is in proportion to the gap between the story that a brand or a celebrity brand is telling and the reality. The more the gap, the more interesting it is. Here, there was a gap between [Hogan's] rather boastful sexual persona that was on display in these radio interviews and elsewhere and the real story, which made it interesting."

As a counter-example, Denton mentioned the nude photos of Jennifer Lawrence and other celebrities that leaked last year, which Gawker did not publish.

"When the Jennifer Lawrence photographs were leaked, was that true that it was her? I think she confirmed it, so yes it was true," he said. "Was it interesting? Was there any lie being exposed there? ... That wouldn't satisfy, to my mind, the test of being both true and interesting."

With the sex tape, though, Gawker did expose some lies. After the video had been recorded in 2006, but before Gawker published its post in 2012, Hogan had said in an interview that he would never sleep with Clem. Once screenshots of the video were published in early 2012, many speculated online that Bubba had set up the cameras in order to catch Hogan and Clem cheating. Gawker's publication of excerpts of the sex tape, which revealed that Bubba had encouraged Hogan and Clem to have sex, refuted both of these false narratives.

Denton is proud of publishing the video taken from Hogan's sex tape. He sees it as a quintessential Gawker story—entirely true, about a celebrity who peddled a false narrative but brought public attention upon himself, and involving sex. The suit, he said, has actually strengthened the company, since all of Gawker's different divisions—tech, operations, sales, and editorial—are united behind the company's decision to publish the post and defend it in court.

"The story was a real sober take on a version of events that [Hogan] had been talking about," he said. "If you don't defend that, then what do you defend? You might as well

just take the First Amendment and tear it up.”

MORE: MEDIA DIGITAL MEDIA GAWKER GAWKER MEDIA HEATHER DIETRICK HULK HOGAN LAW NICK DENTON PRIVACY

Author: Peter Sterne

MORE IN MEDIA

Gawker buyout watch

AROUND THE WEB

More From The Web

Sponsored Links by Taboola



Forbes Top 50 Colleges of 2014
Forbes



The Stunning Evolution of Millennials: They've Become the Ben Franklin...
The Huffington Post | Wealthfront



Women's Maxi Dresses Up to 70% off Here!
Zulily



Forget The iPhone 7. Next Apple Sensation Leaked
The Motley Fool

MORE FROM CAPITAL



Gawker buyout watch



Sampson guilty on three counts, forfeits Senate seat



New Gawker will be '20 percent nicer,' Denton tells staff



Sulzberger scion Sam Dolnick gets a promotion at the Times

313 Comments Capital New York

Login

Recommend 3 Share

Sort by Best

Join the discussion

Peter885 · 2 months ago
"As a counter-example, Denton mentioned the nude photos of Jennifer Lawrence and other celebrities that leaked last year, which Gawker did not publish."

The only thing the Jennifer Lawrence example proves is Gawker's hypocrisy. When nude pics of Lawrence and other female celebrities were leaked last year, Gawker was up in arms over it with one of their blogs calling it a "sex crime".

But when the celebrity involved is male, Gawker's position changes entirely. Not only was there the Hogan tape, but there was also another example ironically involving another pro wrestler. WWE's Seth Rollins had nude pics leaked on the internet without his permission and Gawker not only published them, they did so with a headline that read something like "Come Look At Seth Rollins' D--k". Which they later changed because it looked so hypocritical.

Denton's own "is it interesting?" test completely falls apart here because comparatively Rollins is a much lesser known celebrity than Jennifer Lawrence. There is going to be far less interest in his photos or the story surrounding them. Yet Gawker still saw fit to publish them anyway.

The sole reason the pics of Lawrence and other female celebrities weren't published on Gawker is because they cater to progressive feminists and it would have angered both their readership and members of their staff. They have don't have to worry about that when the celebrity is male and they've already demonstrated a clear double standard.

That Gawker is trying to turn around and use that double standard as a defense in the Hogan matter is nothing short of laughable.

11/21/2015 11:00 AM • Reply • Share



Hendrik Vanderstijn • 11/21/2015 • 2:00 PM ago

"In defense of me stealing your bike, here's all the other bikes that I didn't steal, even though I had the opportunity to do so"

03 • 0 • Reply • Share



rct • 11/21/2015 • 2:00 PM ago

Deadspin posted the pics of Kate Upton (wife of Tigers pitcher Justin Verlander), so Denton is lying. They also posted geo-cached information from the pics in order to determine if they were taken during a Tigers road trip.

But also, all Gawker sites were linking to the pics, so it's not much of a distinction.

In truth, there is no difference between the Hogan thing and the Fappening. Gawker is hypocritical to the extreme.

01 • 0 • Reply • Share



wetboy • 11/21/2015 • 2:00 PM ago

Agreed, Gawker is evil and deserves to a slow death. But FWIW, Kate Upton just dated Verlander, she didn't marry him.

0 • 0 • Reply • Share



Thought • 11/21/2015 • 2:00 PM ago

The gawk

0 • 0 • Reply • Share



DarthDisney • 11/21/2015 • 2:00 PM ago

Gawker would do anything, even ruin the world to make a cash. Denton is a piece of shit, and I have zero respect for anyone who works there.

1 • 0 • Reply • Share



C. D. Carney • 11/21/2015 • 2:00 PM ago

I have to say I like most of the J Law pics and have a very small interest in seeing an older wrestler having sex with someone I've never heard of 9 years ago. So if this guy and Gawker really wanted to post something sex and celeb related for page views they would have posted the J-Law pics (but knew he would immediately have faced far more than a 100 million dollar lawsuit) and hence we know he did this because he thought he wouldn't be held to account over this issue.

2 • 0 • Reply • Share



Sarah Jessica Parker • 11/21/2015 • 2:00 PM ago

Don't forget the Gene Simmons sex tape.

0 • 0 • Reply • Share



LeonTheKungFuJew • 11/21/2015 • 2:00 PM ago

Thanks for ruining my day.

Gene Simmons isn't a Kiss bandmember. He's the ugliest jew in the world!

0 • 0 • Reply • Share



Gus Mueller • 11/21/2015 • 2:00 PM ago

Surely not uglier than Joan Rivers' rotting corpse.


0 • 0 • Reply • Share





William Wallace • 11/21/2015 • 2:00 PM ago


Plastic doesn't rot.


0 • 0 • Reply • Share


 **King Kong** [@kingkong](#) • 2 months ago
THAT list is endless!!

 **guest** [@guest](#) • 2 months ago
Where does the former Dem Mass. US Rep Barnie Frank fit in the list?


 **TheGreenButterfly** [@TheGreenButterfly](#) • 2 months ago
IN THE BACK as always.

 **a French Chef** [@aFrenchChef](#) • 2 months ago
I'm trying, I'm trying.

 **Aj Retro** [@AjRetro](#) • 2 months ago
Didn't Gawker also have no problem sharing nude photos of Olivia Munn? They called people who wanted to see nude JLaw photos rapists because they were butthurt they didn't get to the photos first.

 **koopapoopas** [@koopapoopas](#) • 2 months ago
I know you needed to put some anti feminist MRA type of digs in there, but don't you think after the Hogan Lawsuit, they wanted to turn the heat down and just post links instead of the actual pictures?

I hate Gawker, BTW.


 **Peter885** [@Peter885](#) • 2 months ago
"I know you needed to put some anti feminist MRA type of digs in there"

What did I say that's a dig? Does Gawker Media not cater to a progressive feminist audience? Did that audience not view the so-called "fappening" scandal in a negative light? Comparatively, was there little to no outrage when GM hypocritically posted the nude pictures of Rollins?

I didn't intend any of that as an insult. It's just the way it is. The Rollins pictures were essentially revenge porn leaked by his angry girlfriend. These days, would they ever post nude pics of a female celeb whose angry boyfriend leaked them? Of course not. They know it wouldn't fly with their audience.

"don't you think after the Hogan Lawsuit, they wanted to turn the heat down and just post links instead of the actual pictures?"

They posted the actual pictures with the Rollins story. So, no.

 **Jesse B.** [@JesseB](#) • 2 months ago
Not really.

What they're saying is Hogan specifically said in an interview that he'd never have sex with Clem. He had said this after they had sex. This exposed that lie. He also pretended, in interviews and books, like he has an amazing and over-the-top sex life. This just exposed that while he is a swinger, he does not have sex that is much different than anyone else. Hogan didn't live up to his own hype.

What Gawker is saying is they would have published the JLaw photos if she had previously done something like give interviews saying that taking nude photos of yourself makes you a wh*re and she'd never stoop to being a wh*re herself. (For the record, I do not believe there is anything wrong with taking or sharing nudes of yourself ... we just live in a prudish society)

They're saying they're looking for a lie about public people who freely talk about their private lives. JLaw didn't lie about anything. She took private photos for a private person and then handled it maturely when they were leaked. She did not double down and deny they were her.

I am not saying whether they're right or wrong, or hypocritical or not. I am merely explaining the internal debate they've previously made public.

1 · Reply · Share



Peter885 · 10/21/15 · 1 month ago

This is what Gawker wrote when the tape was posted.

"Because the internet has made it easier for all of us to be shameless voyeurs and deviants, we love to watch famous people have sex. We watch this footage because it's something we're not supposed to see (sometimes) but we come away satisfied that when famous people have sex it's closer to the sex we as civilians have from time to time. Meaning: it's hardly ever sexy the way we expect it to be sexy, even when the participants are ostensibly more attractive than the majority of our sex partners will be."

You'll note there's no mention of exposing Hogan in a lie. They're trying to retroactively invent some morally superior rationale for posting it than what was said in the blurb I just quoted. It's wholly transparent and deserves no merit, particularly in light of the Seth Rollins example that blows a hole in Denton's supposed "litmus test".

1 · Reply · Share



TheGreenButterfly · 10/21/15 · 1 month ago

You have no "up votes" because you're an IDIOT.

1 · Reply · Share



C. D. Carney · 10/21/15 · 1 month ago

That sounds like a good answer from their point of view (the internal debate) but it's total bull. The main problem with that is that the people who acquired the J Law pics did so unlawfully even if they did simply guess and look for biographical information to gain access to her account. If they published those pics they would have been roasted alive, all celebrities would have come out against them, J Law would have sued, some prosecutor somewhere would take the case and have them considered accomplices to the crime, etc etc. They knew that was illegally acquired material but this is questionably acquired material because the sex was consensual and apparently taped inside a home of the sexed up wife and husband by the sexed up wife and husband. Having not seen the entire tape or the abridged version I can only speculate- did Hogan know he was being taped (if so he obviously was ok with that because he kept going the entire length) or not and if he wasn't consensually taped is that an actual crime? (some locales do not allow someone to be taped if they don't know they're being recorded but others are simply 1-party states)

1 · Reply · Share



killerasteroid · 10/21/15 · 1 month ago

The only debate here is the US Constitution and free speech. No court can prevent publication just because someone (including the court) says it has no public interest. That's not what the Constitution says. There is no "sub clause" attached to the freedom of speech part that says you have to prove public interest before you can say it or print it.

1 · Reply · Share



svobodnik · 10/21/15 · 1 month ago

"Freedom of speech" obviously does not mean you can say anything you wish - walk into an airport and start talking about "bombs" - and you'll find that out. Likewise if someone sits in a tree and takes photos of your mother in the bathroom - they don't have a right to publish those photos.

0 · Reply · Share



TheGreenButterfly · 10/21/15 · 1 month ago

SO THEN you've confirmed your idiot status.

1 · Reply · Share



Vinzenz Stemberg · 10/21/15 · 1 month ago

I think the phrase one is looking for when they see Hogan out of the 'usual' ring is "legend in his own mind." It's entirely possible he does tell himself it was great. It's not like wrestlers lying to themselves more than their fans is anything unique,

hell one of them took it so far as to found his own 'ultimate' religion based on himself. Yeeeah, you all know the one!

10/11/2015 • Reply • Share



Max012 • 2 months ago

Whatcha gonna do Gawker when Hulkmania destroys you?

10/11/2015 • Reply • Share



MrBK • 2 months ago

Gawker basically happened because a bunch of toothless leftwing hillbillies sat down in front of a computer and accidentally signed up for a WordPress account, and the other leftwing hillbillies loved it. The rest is history. It's quite an inspirational story, really.

10/11/2015 • Reply • Share



GivesIt Thought • 2 months ago

Hilarious how you buy the whole "left-wing/right-wing" garbage. There are not two political parties in America, just one political party (the Rich) with two factions convincing you there's a voting choice. And the idiots always fall for it. You're the model American citizen. Congrats. Smart as a box of hammers. United we stand, divided we fall. Keep playing that game plan. You're falling into their hands. America will be completely divided soon.

10/11/2015 • Reply • Share



SharpStick • 2 months ago

That is nonsense. First of all you write "America" three times as if the fact that political parties are fundamentally self serving is something unique to Americas. You are the one as "smart as a box of hammers." And blaming the rich is the "C" student blaming the A student. You sound like you have been listening to the wisdom of the modern Greeks, who themselves turned their country into a cesspool and who have convinced themselves it is the fault of the "rich." It isn't.

That you don't know Gawker group of sites is profoundly partisan you are simply writing out of ignorance

10/11/2015 • Reply • Share



t_green • 2 months ago

are you going to vote for jeb or Hillary.

10/11/2015 • Reply • Share



TAK1 • 2 months ago

Hopefully that won't be the two options. Rand Paul.

10/11/2015 • Reply • Share



MrBK • 2 months ago

Rand Paul FTW! I'm not an American citizen so I should be able to vote for him at least twice.

10/11/2015 • Reply • Share



Vinzenz Stemberg • 2 months ago

Going Bernie (hurrah dual cit) but this will probably be the first it isn't a 'joke vote' write-in for Jorg Haider.

10/11/2015 • Reply • Share



TheGreenButterfly • 2 months ago

FOK RAND PAUL IN THE P[SSY.

10/11/2015 • Reply • Share



TAK1 • 2 months ago

My crush on him doesn't go that far mo.

10/11/2015 • Reply • Share



TAK1 • 2 months ago

MrBK did not say Dem or Repub, he said left. I guess you just want to express yourself on something else. Left is a political philosophy, not a party. Everyone has moved left in the parties anyway. Dems are really progressives, GOP is the Dem party of fifty years ago. There, I am doing it too.

0 · · · · · · Reply · Share



MrBK · 1401 · 4 months ago

^^ What he said ...

0 · · · · · · Reply · Share



David S. Danna · 1401 · 4 months ago

Funny how you buy your own bull shit.

0 · · · · · · Reply · Share



Booch Paradise · 1401 · 4 months ago

The presence of a third faction playing the 2 main factions against each other doesn't mean that the 2 main factions don't exist. So get of you soap box. It doesn't apply to this story and it makes you look like an idiot.

0 · · · · · · Reply · Share



MrBK · 1401 · 4 months ago

"You're the model American citizen."

That's amazing, since I'm not an American citizen. Tell me more!

0 · · · · · · Reply · Share



ManyMoreSpices · 1401 · 4 months ago

Eh. All the leftist idiots who write for that site will just write somewhere else.

7 · · · · · · Reply · Share



Bob Anderson · 1401 · 4 months ago

Check this out music fans... Jimi Hendrix FAKED his death and became Morgan Freeman.... Just one week after we identified who Elvis is. His daughter had to cancel her 100 million dollar Vegas gig.... Google this for your proof.... Wellaware / Elvis.

0 · · · · · · Reply · Share



President Broke Owebummer · 1401 · 4 months ago

The actor who played Herman Munster faked his death and became John Kerry.....Also, Dick York from Bewitched did the same and is really Rachel Maddow...

17 · · · · · · Reply · Share



TAK1 · 1401 · 4 months ago

I thought Mr Ed became John Kerry! Back to conspiracy class for me.

0 · · · · · · Reply · Share



David S. Danna · 1401 · 4 months ago

Fuck your fucking wellaware bullshit.

0 · · · · · · Reply · Share



TAK1 · 1401 · 4 months ago

How were you able to swear here? You actually wrote wellaware!

0 · · · · · · Reply · Share

Avatar

This comment was deleted.



Jesse B. · 1401 · 4 months ago

Oh no, they published public information!\$@&!^

How exactly were gun owners placed in the way of danger? Will the anti-gun, anti-violence people come and have a friendly chat?

0 · · · · · · Reply · Share

Avatar

This comment was deleted.

Load previous comments

[ABOUT US](#)

[EVENTS](#)

[ADVERTISE](#)

[CONTACT](#)

[PRIVACY POLICY](#)

[TERMS AND CONDITIONS](#)