

[return to updates](#)

THE VOTE ON PROPOSITION 37

will be stolen



Photo by Frank Durr—courtesy ALDF Blog

by Miles Mathis

I just read [an article](#) by Mike Adams at NaturalNews.com about the upcoming California vote on proposition 37. This is the proposition which concerns labeling for genetically modified foods. As I have said before, I like Mike Adams, go to his site often, and usually agree with him. But for all his knowledge of health and politics, he remains a bit naïve sometimes. We see that here, when he says that only close elections can be stolen and that the vote on Prop. 37 is close.

Neither are true. As [I showed with the Ron Paul primary votes](#), the hackers can now steal elections that aren't close. They pushed the vote up to 65 percentage points in several states, and may have pushed the vote by that much in *all* states. In most states we don't know how much they pushed the vote, since there is no paper trail to audit. But they got caught pushing the vote by these huge margins in many caucus states, where later caucus votes (by hand) showed up the discrepancies.

That means that even where Ron Paul was winning the real vote by 80% to 15%, he still lost the hacked machine vote.

It also isn't true that the vote on GMO's is close. Mike himself was reporting several months ago that the polls in California and nationwide were more than 9 to 1 against GMO's. As much as 93% *against* genetically modifying foods, and 93% *for* labeling them. [See [this June 2012 poll](#) from ABC news, for instance]. Mike now says that those numbers have fallen, being 44% for labeling and 42% against. I guess he thinks that the TV and radio ads have convinced people that GMO's are safe. But that isn't what is happening. It isn't that Monsanto's expensive campaign is working, it is that Monsanto has bought the polling numbers. The polls are fake. They are pushed, just as the vote soon will be. By reporting these fake poll numbers, Mike is just playing into the hands of Monsanto. His readers will

think the vote was close, and that it was only stolen because a lot of fools fell for the Monsanto advertising. In the article, Mike tells folks that they need to vote yes for labeling by a larger margin, implying that it is their fault for not voting right in higher percentages.

But that isn't the problem. The problem is the voting machines, which could steal this if 100% of the people voted for labeling. **THE MACHINES MUST BE REMOVED!** That was the message we should have gotten from the steal in 2000, the steal in 2004, the steals in 2008, and the Ron Paul steal. The problem this time isn't going to be with the people, it is going to be with the machines. The American voters have a lot of problems, and I am not here to tell you otherwise; but the main problem—and the problem we are going to see with Prop. 37—is not a problem of the actual vote. The main problem is the machines, and the crooks who will use them to subvert the vote one more time.

Just think about it: first we are told that in a national poll, 93% want the government to require labeling of GMO's. Then, four months later, the most liberal state in the union, California, has a state-wide vote on GMO labeling, and we are told that less than 47% supported it. Is that believable? We will be told that No-on-37 ran a brilliant campaign, spending loads on money, and that the people of California were snowed. Do you believe it? I don't. No campaign ever devised could cut support in half within that amount of time (46.9 is half of 93.8). Do you really think the people of California watched a few TV ads and were suddenly convinced GMO's were safe? Do you think the people of California DON'T want to know what is in the food they are eating, especially when most of them know that it hasn't been properly tested, that it has been banned all over Europe, and that it is being pushed by the most evil corporation on the face of the earth, MONSANTO? No, it isn't believable. I don't believe it and neither should you. The vote was stolen, and we may use the numbers above to estimate by how much Monsanto stole it. I would say we have an indication that 30-49% of the vote was stolen. That is to say, in an honest election, I think we may assume Prop. 37 would have passed by anywhere from 75 to 93%.

Hopefully, the failure to recall Governor Walker in Wisconsin and the failure to count the vote of Ron Paul in the primaries and the failure of Prop. 37 in California will get people past the idea that their problems will be solved by getting out the vote and voting correctly. It isn't true. The machines are now stealing votes that aren't even close, and you had best wrap your head around that idea as soon as humanly possible. You had also best figure out something to do about it. I have made several [recommendations in that regard](#), including reinstatement of the write-in, but it will now probably require a nationwide strike on voting day and a massive non-violent take-over of all polling places.

In the short term, there is only one other way this steal could fail to stick, and that is if the leaders of the democratic party in California decide to thoroughly investigate the Prop. 37 vote after it is stolen. The democratic party has endorsed a yes vote, and the party is currently in control of the state, including governor Jerry Brown and attorney general Kamala Harris. The state has the resources to uncover the fraud if its wants to. The only question is whether Brown and Harris have the cohonos to take on Monsanto, since doing so will inevitably lead them into a fight with the federal agencies that are owned by Monsanto. My guess is they don't and won't. If the democratic party were capable of solving this problem on their own, we wouldn't have needed a public referendum in the first place. The democratic party's yes endorsement was just a smokescreen, to make the public think they supported it, while behind the curtain the party knew it was doomed. We have an many indications of this, including the new machines even now going into California. If the democratic party wished to assure a fair vote, they wouldn't allow these machines in. They would tabulate all votes on paper and by hand.

While I am here on this page, I want to comment on something else no one is mentioning. *The Los*

Angeles Times recently endorsed Monsanto, recommending a no vote on Prop. 37. People should find that astonishing. It is astonishing because newspapers are in steep decline, and have been going bankrupt in vast numbers over the past two decades. *The LATimes* is a city newspaper, meaning it is (or was) a newspaper that relied on subscriptions from the people and on local advertising. It never was a *Wall Street Journal* or a *Forbes*, that could rely on a small minority of rich people nationwide, and advertisers for those rich people. In the old days, a city newspaper couldn't afford to alienate 80 or 90% of its readers, by going against them on an important topic of the day. And yet we see the *LATimes* spitting in the face of a vast majority of its supposed readership, lying to them in the most transparent manner. How can they do that?

Mike Adams or Alex Jones might tell you that it is because the vast majority of the readers of the *Times* are idiots. And while that may or may not be true, it isn't the explanation in this case. The *Times* can afford to go against the majority of its own readers because it no longer relies on subscriptions or local advertising for its existence. In other words, it has been bought. *The Times* and most other "city" newspapers are no longer actually city newspapers. They are corporate mouthpieces, owned by the corrupt .1%. They are fronts for the government and are now run directly or indirectly by the CIA. They no longer have to concern themselves with any sort of populism. They don't give a damn what their readers think. They aren't there to side with the people on any issue. They are there to tell the required lies.

I think a lot of people already know that, which is why fewer and fewer people read newspapers. But those of you who don't know that had better wrap your head around it as fast as humanly possible. The *Los Angeles Times* and most other papers should be boycotted. *No one* should subscribe to them. Not one issue should ever leave a box or a newsstand. If that happened, it would be strictly equivalent to a non-violent takeover of the editorial offices. It would achieve exactly the same thing, since the rich aren't going to bother creating propaganda that no one reads.

Update, November 9, 2012: The Democratic party in California just won a supermajority in the legislature for the first time ever. That means they have over 2/3rds of the vote (67%), and can override any resistance from the minority party. It is called one-party rule, and it almost never happens. The last time it happened in California was 1933, and it was the Republicans then. This is important in this context, because it means we can now watch to see if the Democrats were serious about GMO labeling. They endorsed a "yes" vote on Prop. 37, and they now have an unstoppable supermajority in the legislature. What is stopping them from passing a GMO labeling law immediately? Nothing.

Update, November 10, 2012: To read how the Proposition 37 vote actually *was* stolen, you may link to [this newer paper](#), written two weeks later.