

THE PREVARICATOR III: THE CAMPAIGN FOR REELECTION

Get ready. In the next election, Bush will use every dirty trick in Rove's book to win. The ballyhoo of his nominating convention in September 2004 will be an insult to the thousands who died unnecessarily on September 11, 2001.

Hollywood is not necessarily known for its creativity, and once it gets a box-office hit, it keeps churning out sequels until the public gets sick and tired of seeing the same old formula. Running a negative attack campaign got Bush close enough to be given the presidency, even though he lost the election, and it got him control over Congress in the midterm elections, even though he had to beat up a disabled war hero to do it. Now, he's baaaack.

Bush has already exceeded his goal of raising \$170 million in campaign funds, and is on his way to \$200 to \$250 million. Even though he has no opponent in the primaries, he decided to fire a shot at the Democrats, just to keep their heads down. Timed to coincide with a Democratic Primary Debate in Iowa during the last week of November 2003, Bush ran a classic Rove attack ad. Showing Bush presidentially delivering his State of the Union lines, "Our war against terror is a contest of will in which perseverance is power," the ominous screen line says, "Some are now attacking the President for attacking the terrorists." Then, as he says, "Some have said we must not act until the threat is imminent," the screen line runs, "Some call for us to retreat, putting our national security in the hands of others."⁷⁷⁴ Bush "knows we know" that "some" are Democrats, but it's an "unknown unknown," whether he's going to get away with "waving the bloody shirt" this time.⁷⁷⁵

Prevaricator III will be loaded with symbolism. The White House has announced that it is delaying the Republican nominating convention, scheduled for New York City, until the first week in September 2004, the latest in the party's history. This will allow Bush's acceptance speech, slated for September 2,

to coincide with the 9/11 commemoration events scheduled to occur in the city. A coincidence?

Samuel Johnson once said, "Patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel." Bush keeps running around the country posing for photo ops in military jackets and spending millions in scarce military funds so he can be photographed climbing out of an airplane in front of a phony "Mission Accomplished" sign, and holding up a fake Thanksgiving turkey in Baghdad. However, he's not risking his life; he's putting the lives and futures of our children at risk. And he is spending the capital of our youth recklessly and cynically in fighting the wrong war for the wrong reasons. We Americans are used to rallying around the flag, and we will continue to do so. But once we realize that our President has drenched our flag in the blood of our children and that he is dragging our flag and their blood through the dirt of his nasty lying politics, we will throw the scoundrel out of office.

No matter how much Bush and Ashcroft try to make it appear unpatriotic to oppose Bush's War, opposition is a healthy thing, and it is the American way. A few days after the attack on Pearl Harbor, Republican Senator Robert Taft stated, "As a matter of general principle, I believe there can be no doubt that criticism in time of war is essential to the maintenance of any kind of democratic government ... because the maintenance of the right of criticism in the long run will do the country maintaining it a great deal more good than it will do the enemy, and will prevent mistakes which might otherwise occur."⁷⁷⁶

Bush raised \$100 million for the 2000 primaries and, even though he is unopposed this time around, he has already raised over \$170 million in an attempt to bury the successful Democratic candidate. Political scientist Donald F. Kettl believes the Bush campaign is "lying in wait, hoping to kneecap a Democratic candidate likely to emerge from the primaries wobbly and out of cash. ... This could well be the most effective Rose Garden campaign in history, backed by a war chest the Democrats don't have a prayer of matching."⁷⁷⁷

Bush is expected to take in as much as \$250 million before the election is over. As of March 14th, 187 "Rangers" have raised at least \$200,000 each for Bush, and 455 "Pioneers" have

raised at least \$100,000. The campaign has banked approximately \$590,000 per day since June 2003.⁷⁷⁸

But all that money really doesn't matter, Bush probably won't need to waste a dime of his hard-earned funds on attack ads. According to Pat Robertson, God has already picked the winner. "The Lord has just blessed him. I mean he could make terrible mistakes and come out of it. It doesn't make any difference what he does, good or bad; God picks him up because he's a man of prayer and God's blessing him."⁷⁷⁹

Do you have questions in your mind about voting for the re-election of Bush? Do you really want a president who cares nothing for you, your children, and your aging parents? Do you feel guilty, sinful or unpatriotic because of your thoughts? You're not stupid! Get the truth.

Wired to Win

If you recall, Republican Saxby Chambliss allegedly defeated Democrat Max Cleland in the 2002 senatorial race in Georgia. Although the Chambliss victory undoubtedly benefited from Bush's repeated personal attacks on Cleland and the "slime" television ads questioning Cleland's patriotism, not to mention the \$14 million spent on the election by the Republicans, there may have been another and more sinister factor at play.

The last minute pre-election polls showed Cleland ahead by two to five points; however, Chambliss won 53 percent of the votes in the election, a difference of 12 points, far beyond the margin for statistical error. An analysis of the vote showed Chambliss exceeding Republican totals from the primary by as much as 22 points in the strongly Democratic regions of southern Georgia. Equally surprising, votes for Cleland went up 14 percent in the Republican areas of northern Georgia.

Amazingly, in the race for governor, the pre-election polls showed the Democratic incumbent ahead of the Republican challenger by 9 to 11 percent; however, the Republican candidate was elected by a margin of 51 to 46 percent, a statistical reversal of 16 percent. These bizarre results are strangely coincidental with the introduction of statewide computerized voting in Georgia.⁷⁸⁰

In 2002, Georgia became the first state to use electronic touch-screen voting in a statewide election as a result of the \$3 billion Help American Vote Act signed by Bush following the 2000 election fiasco. Georgia paid Diebold Election Systems \$54 million to install the secret computerized system, which leaves no paper trail and which cannot be audited, post election, for accuracy.⁷⁸¹

According to Rob Behler, a Diebold contractor, there were constant problems with the touch-screen system that resulted in at least three “patches” or updates to the programming being installed at the last minute, after the equipment had been independently certified and without the knowledge of the secretary of state. Behler described the system as “JS equipment” or “Junk s**t, with error rates of up to 25 percent,⁷⁸² and said that votes “could have been manipulated.”⁷⁸³

Behler reports that “the code for the patches was posted to an Internet FTP [file transfer protocol] site, along with all of the election software... However, even if the FTP site were password protected, experts said it would have been a relatively simple task to hack into the location and insert rogue code, which might be designed to affect election results.”⁷⁸⁴

Diebold has refused to comment on its voting machines or the Georgia election, except to deny that there were any patches installed, claiming that to comment would place its proprietary, copyrighted information at risk. Surprisingly, Diebold doesn’t have to discuss its system with anyone, including its own clients. Under the Digital Millennium Copyright Act, purchasers are not allowed access to information on how the results are recorded.⁷⁸⁵

In August 2003, Diebold’s CEO, Walden O’Dell, attended a gathering of “Rangers and Pioneers” at Bush’s ranch, where the attendees pledged to raise money in bundles of \$100,000 and \$200,000 for Bush’s reelection. Eleven Diebold executives have given a total of \$22,000, the legal maximum, to Bush in the current election cycle. O’Dell raised an additional \$500,000 for the campaign at a fundraiser he hosted for Vice President Cheney at his home.⁷⁸⁶

Neither Diebold, its CEO, any of its executives, or any other manufacturer of voting systems have made campaign contributions to any Democratic candidates.⁷⁸⁷

Do you remember Florida Secretary of State Katherine Harris and the role she played in the 2000 presidential election? Although the current Secretary of State, Glenda Hood, has promised that Florida has “the very best” technology available, there were abundant problems in the March 2004 primary. “Voters were wrongly given computer cards that let them vote only on local issues, not in the presidential primary,” and many machines did not work.

Since the Supreme Court ruling in *Bush v. Gore* requires states to use comparable recount methods from county to county, and since 15 Florida counties that use electronic voting machines do not produce paper records that can be recounted, a Florida congressman has filed a federal lawsuit to require paper audit trails.⁷⁸⁸

Do you trust election officials to remain nonpartisan in deciding whether secret voting machines are properly certified and operating as designed? In at least two swing states, Missouri and Michigan, the secretaries of state occupy top positions in their state’s Bush-Cheney campaigns.⁷⁸⁹

In California, Secretary of State Kevin Shelley, a Democrat, withdrew his approval of electronic voting machines throughout the state after officials of Diebold Election Systems allegedly lied to state officials and used unapproved software in its equipment. Shelley said, “They broke the law. Their conduct was absolutely reprehensible.” Ten counties that rely upon other electronic voting systems may be allowed to use the equipment if they certify that they meet 23 new requirements, including offering a paper ballot to any voter who requests it and releasing the software code to the secretary of state for evaluation.⁷⁹⁰

Should we trust Diebold or any other electronic voting company to secretly make changes to computerized voting machines after they have been certified, without notifying election officials of the changes, without allowing us to know how their systems operate, and without providing a paper audit

trail? If these practices disturb you, go to <http://www.blackboxvoting.org> to find like-minded patriots.

You're not stupid! Get the truth.

774. Saletan, William and Jacob Weisberg, "Treason's Greetings," *Slate*, November 25, 2003, <http://slate.msn.com/id/2091666/>.

775. "More Waving of the Bloody Shirt," October 14, 2003, <http://www.discriminations.us/storage/002245.html>.

776. *The Papers of Robert Taft* (Kent, 1997), p. 303, <http://hnn.us/articles/631>.

777. Simon, Richard, "In Race for Funds, Bush Is the Winner," *Los Angeles Times*, January 8, 2004, p. A8.

778. Justice, Glen, "Newcomers Provide Fuel for Bush Money Machine," *The New York Times*, March 14, 2004, www.nytimes.com/2004/03/14/politics/campaign/14MONE.html.

779. Scheer, Robert, "Lord Knows What Robertson Wants," *Los Angeles Times*, January 6, 2004, p. B13.

780. Moore, *Bush's War for Reelection*, op. cit., pp. 289-293.

781. *Ibid.*, p. 293.

782. *Ibid.*, p. 294.

783. Cohen, Adam, "The Results Are in and the Winner Is...or Maybe Not," *The New York Times*, February 29, 2004, www.nytimes.com/2004/02/29/opinion/29SUN3.html.

784. Moore, *Bush's War for Reelection*, op. cit., p. 295.

785. *Ibid.*, p. 296.

786. *Ibid.*, p. 305, 306.

787. *Ibid.*, p. 306.

788. "Florida as the Next Florida," *The New York Times*, March 14, 2004, <http://www.nytimes.com/2004/03/14/opinion/14SUN1.html>.

789. "When the Umpires Take Sides," *The New York Times*, March 29, 2004, <http://www.nytimes.com/2004/03/29/opinion/29MON1.html>.

790. Pfeifer, Stuart, "State Blocks Digital Voting," *Los Angeles Times*, May 1, 2004, <http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-machines1may01,1,3927648.story?coll=la-home>; see also

Schwartz, John, "High-Tech Voting System Is Banned in California," *The New York Times*, May 1, 2004, <http://www.nytimes.com/2004/05/01/national/01VOTE.html>.