

[return to updates](#)

THE DEATH OF DEMOCRACY



by Miles Mathis

Although anyone awake must have known that elections were being stolen, I don't think anyone really knew the extent of it, *until now*. Even I was naïve enough to say recently that elections that weren't close probably couldn't be stolen. That is because, until recently, they couldn't be. If Gore voters had outvoted Bush voters three to one in Florida in 2000, I don't think they could have stolen that election. They almost didn't get away with it as it was, and Gore only had a few percentage points more than Bush. Same with Kerry and Bush in Ohio in 2004. We know from exit polling and other after-the-fact evidence that Kerry was only up by something like 52-48; and, even so, they barely made the steal stick.

But the fact that Ron Paul has stayed in the Republican Presidential race all the way to the present time has provided us with data we have never had before. The mainstream media is ignoring this evidence, of course, but even the most progressive bloggers aren't reading it right, either. Some of the most glaring evidence is coming out of Louisiana, which has long been known as one of the most politically corrupt places outside of Chicago. Remember Huey Long? It has gotten only marginally better since then.

In February, the mainstream media reported that Ron Paul got 6% of the vote in the Louisiana primary. Then in May they were forced to admit grudgingly that the regional caucuses had gone to Ron Paul by a large margin. [The national report was and still is 74%](#). That means Ron Paul had 74% of the grassroots support at the local level, determined not by machines but by real people showing up and raising their hands. Romney supporters and the GOP establishment tried to spin that fact by yelling that Ron Paul supporters were stealing the process and ignoring the will of the voters. But that is simply a reversal of the truth. When you get caught stealing, the best thing to do is point to the guy next to you and say, "*I wasn't stealing, he was stealing.*"

Why is it a reversal of the truth? Because the Ron Paul people weren't stealing anything. They were just showing up to caucus. That is how it is done. If they don't want people showing up to caucus, they

shouldn't have caucuses. And you know what, they probably won't next time. They will have the primary vote stolen by their machines and outlaw actual people meeting to be counted by hand. In many states, they already do that. They don't have real people showing up and talking to one another. They just have a virtual vote created by their machines. They go behind closed doors and decide how many votes each candidate will get, and then create software to guarantee that.

You see, we have two sets of numbers that don't match, and the GOP establishment is trying to cast doubt on the second set of numbers. But it is the first set of numbers that we should be questioning. We have the machine votes from February, where Romney is said to have gotten 49% to Paul's 6%. Then we have the caucus votes in April and May, where Paul got 74% to Romney's 20%. We know they both can't be right, so the GOP establishment needs to misdirect you from the obvious answer. The obvious answer is that the machine votes were stolen. They just decided beforehand to give Romney 49% and Ron Paul 6%, they wrote that into their software, and inserted it into the voting machines. The machines votes have never been verified, and if Louisiana is like other states, they probably aren't verifiable or auditable. There is probably no paper trail. You are expected to believe the numbers simply because you saw them reported in the paper.

That is the pretty obvious answer. But to keep you from seeing it, the GOP establishment rushes to misdirect you. They jump out of the blocks the instant this data hits the presses and start spinning it. They make you think that 1) A lot of people in Louisiana must have changed their minds between February and May, but they are not allowed to do that. By law, we must stick to the first votes. Or, 2) Ron Paul supporters are hijacking the caucuses, by talking louder than everyone else and being bullies.

Both are false. Both are lies. The people of Louisiana didn't change their minds in between February and May. The vote in February was rigged. 49% of Republican voters *never* preferred Romney, and never voted for him. Only the machines voted for him. As for 2) it is also the opposite of the truth. It hasn't been Ron Paul supporters who have acted like bullies and thugs, in Louisiana or anywhere else. In state after state, it has been the GOP establishment that has broken the rules in plain sight, tried to hijack caucuses by dirty tricks or force, and hired police or security to intimidate, arrest, and actually assault voters. [In Louisiana yesterday](#), security hired by the state caucus broke the hip of a Ron Paul supporter who ended up being elected the state chairman, and police broke the fingers of another Ron Paul delegate who did nothing but show up and try to vote his conscience. Apparently that is now an offense punishable by a beating, in Louisiana and pretty much everywhere else.

What does all this mean? What is the bottom line? The bottom line is that in state after state, we are seeing proof that the original primary vote on machines was stolen by a *gigantic* margin. The actual support for Paul over Romney in Louisiana was something on the order of 3 to 1, 75% to 25%. But by creating their own software and manipulating the machines, they were able to report in February that Romney beat Paul by 8 to 1. If you do the math, that is the equivalent of pushing the results **64 percentage points**.

With Gore in 2000, they stole 1 or 2 percentage points. With Kerry in 2004, they stole 2 to 4 percentage points. With Paul, they have stolen over 60 percentage points, in state after state. In other states that have had caucuses, we have seen the same thing. In Minnesota, Missouri, Iowa, Colorado, Nevada, Maine, and even Romney's home state of Massachusetts, we have seen primary votes on machines which make it look like Paul was soundly beaten, and then a few months later, caucus votes in which Paul all but sweeps the state. Just as another example, look at the numbers from Minnesota. In February, it was reported that Paul got 27% of the machine vote. He now has 80% of the delegates. Almost the same numbers are now being reported from Maine, where Paul also has about 80% of the

delegates.

You will say, “Well, if they didn't make it stick, it wasn't much of a stealing, was it?” Problem is, they *have* made it stick in a majority of states. A majority of states don't have these open caucuses like Louisiana and Minnesota. All they have are the machines voting. In those states, it is much harder for flesh-and-blood voters to be counted, because nothing resembling a hand count ever gets taken. The whole thing is virtual.

And in Louisiana (and Nevada and other states), they have ways of stealing the votes back, even after the local caucuses. As we just saw reported in the news yesterday, they aren't afraid to stop at actual beatings in order to prevent delegates from continuing on to the National Convention. We know that 74% of the regional delegates were for Paul, but at the state convention yesterday, [Paul ended up with only 59% of the delegates](#). How did he lose 15% so fast? This is how: The establishment refused to step down from chairs they had legally been voted out of, then hired off-duty cops to arrest and assault the newly elected chairpeople. When the remaining Paul delegates refused to disband or give up, the establishment cronies split the convention and refused to recognize the majority. It is entirely possible that the national GOP—which of course is made up of the same sort of establishment cronies—will side with the minority in Louisiana. I fully expect that the Ron Paul supporters will be forced out of the National Convention, where they will have to start their own convention or their own third party. Expect more arrests and beatings in Tampa, and expect more upside-down reporting, where the Ron Paul people will be said to be instigators of violence instead of victims.

I already know what a lot of readers will say. They will say something like, “What do I care about Ron Paul? He is against abortion. I plan to vote Democrat anyway. Those Republicans were always cheaters, and this is just more proof of it.” Wrong answer. That kind of answer comes from people who haven't done their homework, aren't paying attention, or are taking too many prescription meds. To start with, this has very little to do with whether you like or agree with Ron Paul or not. It has to do with whether you like democracy or not. It has to do with whether you want your vote to be counted or not. If it can happen to Ron Paul, it can happen to your candidate, and certainly will.

In fact, if you are a Democrat and voted for Hillary Clinton in 2008, you need to do some research. They never got around to stealing 60 percentage points from Hillary—because they didn't need to—but in several states [they got caught](#) manipulating the Democratic primaries in favor of Obama. If you didn't know that, it is because you didn't want to know that.

Another thing to consider is that neither Gore nor Kerry nor Hillary Clinton spent any time or effort investigating vote fraud. Gore voted against himself in the Senate in 2000, when Congress was verifying the election results. Very odd. That's right. He was Vice President at the time, and the Vice President breaks ties in the Senate. The Senate deadlocked 50-50 in 2000, forcing Gore to break the tie. *He voted against himself!*

In a similar fashion, Kerry mysteriously refused to take part in investigating vote fraud in 2004. When other Senators and Representatives (see Conyers and Kucinich) brought evidence of fraud in Ohio to the House and Senate floors, Kerry showed no interest. You would have thought both Gore and Kerry would be interested in solving some of the problems that kept them from being elected, but they weren't. And neither was Hillary Clinton. None of them ever once suggested that these hacked computers should be taken out of elections, that Diebold should be investigated by the Department of

Justice, or that greater transparency should be the goal in voting.

I will tell you the reason why: the Democrats were just as interested in having hackable computers in voting as the Republicans, since this hacking of elections has been very useful for both parties. It has made elections much easier to manipulate for both parties, and they don't want to lose that. Just think about it: both parties can now push the vote at least 60 percentage points, and the voters won't question it. If they can push the vote 60 percentage points, they can push it any amount they want. Since they have successfully disenfranchised Ron Paul and all his voters in a majority of states, with no serious questions asked or investigations, they have been given the green light to do whatever they want. They don't have to limit their manipulation to stealing close elections. No, they can now steal any and all elections, from President down to City Clerk. They have proven to themselves that this is possible. All they needed were the cohones to try it. From now on, the vote will be decided by a room full of fatcats, bargaining for percentages over caviar and cigars. It worked with Ron Paul, so it will now be the default position. The head hacker will just say something like, "How many percentage points should we give to Paul in California? We can't give him zero, that would look suspicious. But we don't want to give him double digits, either, because that might risk a groundswell. How about 9%? People will buy that." And then they just have their technicians write the software and the work is done. They could report it to the media even before the election.

And you know what, they have. [Newsmax reported the Romney victory in Nevada](#) two days before the primary election. Beyond that, I would bet anything and everything I have that the Texas primary was just stolen with these computers, but we may never find out, despite upcoming Texas caucuses. Texas awards 2/3rds of its delegates based on the primary vote, so the Ron Paul crowd has less incentive to storm the state caucus. Even with a complete takeover in Texas, Ron Paul could only get a maximum of 1/3 of the total delegates. That is still possible, but unlikely. What we need to see in places like Texas is non-bound delegates and transparent primary voting. All the computers and hackable tabulators need to be thrown in the river, and every vote should have a paper trail that can be audited. And for the next decade, every vote *should be* audited.

Here's a question: why isn't Ron Paul asking for an audit of his own 14th and 22nd Texas Congressional districts, where they are telling him he was beaten by Romney in the Texas primary? Who believes that? These districts have voted Paul in for twelve terms—the last one by 76%—but they are going to vote for a Mormon from Massachusetts over their own guy? By 3.7 to 1? That's right, they are reporting that Romney got almost 4 times as many votes as Paul in Galveston! If only Paul and Romney were on the ballot, that would come out to 79 to 21 for Romney. Only a zombie would believe that. Where are the exit polls from Galveston? [Here is the answer to both questions.](#) Computers means there is no paper trail to audit, and exit polling is purposely neutered to prevent localized numbers. The game is rigged. Paul has talked about computers in elections, but almost no one else has.

All the elections are now rigged, as we saw last night in Wisconsin, where Walker stole the election with computer software. Gray Davis of California is the last high ranking official that will ever be recalled (that was 2003). Since the incumbent administration is in control of the computers, they are now bulletproof. They can do anything they want and there isn't thing one you can do about it (via voting, anyway).

In conclusion, things are much much worse than we thought. I honestly don't like being the bearer of bad tidings, but the tidings are bad. Not only are elections being stolen in plain sight, but very few seem to care. The Democrats and Romney supporters are watching all this with a blasé grin, as if it

doesn't concern them. Romney and his supporters don't seem to have any problem winning this way, which is the worst tidings possible. I like to win, but I like to win by winning, not by ripping off the other guy. I would appear to be in a dwindling minority, since most people in both parties have lost all respect for fairness, honesty, or truth. They just want to win, and if that means hiring the cops to arrest and beat the other voters, they are fine with that.

Obama voters are perhaps even more complacent and blasé. They don't care if Romney is stealing 100% from Paul, as long as Obama's Goldman Sachs mafia turns out to be more powerful than Romney's in the general election. The fact that voting has now become a complete sham doesn't seem to register with many people. If they take the time to discuss politics, this issue doesn't even come up. For instance, 1980's progressive Jackson Browne (the Pretender) recently said he was going to vote for Obama, though he wasn't happy about it. That is the limit now of neo-progressivism, apparently. Bruce Springsteen said the same thing, indicating that although he wouldn't campaign for Obama, he would still vote for him. Way to draw the line, Boss. Joan Baez, the 1960's progressive, was still blowing kisses to Obama in 2010, and I haven't heard anything substantial from her since then. So we may assume she feels the same way as Browne and Springsteen. And even Bob Dylan can't find the balls to speak out. He is accepting a Freedom Medal from Obama this week, in a ceremony that should make everyone sick.

He used to care, but things have changed.

I have seen the same sort of squishy, tepid, useless progressivism at Opednews, which I recently quit. Despite trying to position themselves as leftists or progressives, the editors there are blocking publication or discussion of any issue that might keep Obama from being re-elected. They are under the strange illusion that being a Democrat automatically makes you more progressive than the other guy. It doesn't. Obama isn't to the left of anybody. Obama isn't more progressive than anybody. With the NDAA and the drones and so on, Obama is now actually to the RIGHT of Bush. Obama has assassinated more people and thrown up more debt and bailed out more rich bankers than Bush ever did. Obama has gutted greater parts of the Constitution than Bush. But Jackson Browne and all the other phony progressives don't seem to care. The most emotion they can muster about three illegal wars and trillions in new debt and the rise of the police state is "not happy about it."

Citizens are marching in countries all over the world, fighting corruption and demanding democracy. Egypt, Greece, Spain, Canada, Iceland, Ireland and many other countries are in the streets, joining together by the tens of thousands. But at public gatherings here, we still "support the troops". The Occupy Wall Street hippies still carry Obama signs. David Letterman, the Late Night hero of 1980's college students like me, is now campaigning for Obama on his talk show, asking "[after the killing of bin Laden] what more do we want Obama to do for us?" After I finish retching, I will tell you. He could come through on at least one of his thousand campaign promises. He could close Guantanamo, quit signing statements, not hire lobbyists, not appoint former company heads to the regulation agencies that oversee those companies, could bring the troops home, could quit starting illegal wars, could quit murdering innocent people with drones, could quit undermining foreign countries (like Syria, now) via the CIA and false reporting, could quit torturing, could quit signing illegal legislation like the Patriot acts and the NDAA, could release his records, and so on.

And I have a question for you. What would it take for you to stop supporting the troops? It is now generally known that the troops [murdered their own comrade, Pat Tillman](#). They routinely murder [innocent civilians, and laugh about it](#).^{*} They throw [puppies off cliffs](#) and laugh about it. They torture and sexually [humiliate prisoners](#), taking pictures of themselves doing it. They loot entire towns and

cities, [including major museums](#). And all that is on top of being the frontline for illegal wars that have killed millions. Is that really what you support?

That is the tragedy of modern American life. Not that the government mobsters steal elections and run illegal wars and install the police state and allow bankers to loot the treasury, but that a majority of Americans stand by and watch it happen. The worst of them put bumper stickers on their cars actively supporting all this, and those who think of themselves as the best “aren't happy about it” but vote for Obama anyway.

The greatest sign of hope I have seen in a while is the Ron Paul swell of delegates in the last month, not only because it blows the lid off vote fraud, but also because it shows that not everyone has been lulled to sleep. The Ron Paul voters may yet disprove my last paragraph. The Ron Paul Revolution has shown that a majority of Republican voters in many states have not fallen for the disinfo they have been fed on TV, and it probably shows that a majority of Republican voters in ALL states have not fallen for it. We now have proof that these caucus states were stolen, which means that the odds are very high that *all* the states were stolen. But only the caucus states allowed the truth to emerge.

Is this “majority of Republican voters” a real majority? In other words, what will the Democrats do? After losing all the blue Republicans to Ron Paul, how many Democrats are left? And if the vote is rigged, how will we ever know the answer to that? Once the caucuses are over, we are back to the hacked machines. The fatcats will decide who will be elected in November, no matter how many people in either party vote for Ron Paul. If Ron Paul starts his own third party, he better bring his own vote tabulators with him. None of this will ever be solved as long as we are ruled by the machines.

*If you don't believe me, you can go [here](#) and read John Pilger—a worldwide war correspondent for 50 years—say the same thing I am saying, and more.