

---

## New Hampshire

---

# How the controlled environment was broken

by Andrew Spannaus

This reporter participated in, and thus got a first-hand view of, the break-up of the controlled atmosphere around the Feb. 1 New Hampshire primary. Coming into the election, the national political machines, and especially the national news media, thought that they had already decided who the Democratic and Republican nominees for the year 2000 Presidential elections would be. Al Gore and George W. Bush were covered as if they were already running against one another in the general election, rather than contesting for their parties' respective nominations. What happened in the weeks before the primary, though, made it clear that voters are not quite willing to play this game: Gore and Bush were cut down to size in the New Hampshire primary, and now the Presidential primaries have been thrown open in a way that could lead to a fundamental change in U.S. politics.

The change which the New Hampshire voters brought about, was largely in reaction to the pre-packaged nature of the campaigns of the "front-runners." Everything was set up to make things look good on television, while carefully avoiding any discussion of the real problems which threaten the United States and the world today. One of the first chinks in this armor, was the exchange that took place between Gore and this reporter, on Jan. 14 during a press conference at a seniors home in Concord. In his speech, Gore had waxed emotional about his father's "heroic" fight for civil rights when he was a U.S. Senator. Afterwards, when Gore called on me, I asked him how he could say that his father fought for civil rights, when he had voted against the 1964 Civil Rights Act? Cutting me off before I could finish my question, Gore responded, "I didn't say that he didn't do that—vote against it. As a matter of fact, that's the single vote that he most regretted in his career in the Senate. What news service are you with?" When told *EIR*, Gore said, "That's the Lyndon LaRouche publication, right? We'll move on to the next question." At the end of the press conference, I was approached by Gore campaign staffers and security guards who angrily asked me for identification, and then showed me the door.

Although all of the major press were at the event, no one, as far as I know, covered the exchange. This, despite the fact that Gore had just publicly admitted to lying about his father's record on civil rights. In fact, at an event in Los Angeles last summer, Gore had angrily denied that his father had voted

against the Civil Rights Act, while the person who had asked the question was being carried out in handcuffs. Despite the silence of the press, though, the first salvo had been fired. From that point on, the LaRouche movement dogged Gore with the truth, not only about his father's record on civil rights, but also regarding the Democratic National Committee's (DNC) attempt to use LaRouche to abolish the 1965 Voting Rights Act, and on Gore's genocidal policies on welfare and toward underdeveloped nations.

As the truth about Gore's racism and lying began to spread by word of mouth, thanks to pointed interventions by *EIR* reporters and the LaRouche campaign, and the distribution of thousands of broadsides documenting the attempt by a cabal in the DNC to abolish the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the Gore campaign began to get nervous. At the next event in which I tried to participate, a Gore campaign staffer had me escorted out by the Secret Service, after telling them that I had been "disruptive" at a previous event. In the world of Al Gore, anything that breaks up his carefully crafted, but fake and hollow image, is "disruptive."

In the last two weeks of the campaign, Gore's paranoia grew by the day. Gore called campaign meetings which only pre-chosen supporters were allowed to attend. At each event, voters had to be on a list in order to participate. On one occasion, numerous people were turned away from a "Town Hall Meeting for Undecided Voters" in the town of Amherst. As one young man angrily told a Gore staffer, "You say that there's disaffection among young people. Well, this is the kind of thing which will only make it worse."

At that meeting, it became clear just how fake the "enthusiastic" support for Gore was. The "energized voters" rallying outside the entrance to the Amherst Elementary School had been bussed in, in order to make a show for the media. In fact, they didn't even attend the event. When the meeting began, they just got back in their vans and left!

By Jan. 31, the day before the primary, it was nearly impossible for a citizen to find out where Gore would be speaking. He cancelled several events on the same day, and even his supporters were forced to drive around looking for him.

These actions by the Gore campaign were clearly in response to the repeated interventions by LaRouche Democrats, confronting Gore on his lying and racism at every possible opportunity. On many occasions, as Gore stepped off his campaign bus on the way to some pre-packaged meeting, he was confronted on his lying, and on his refusal to debate LaRouche.

Protesters began to follow Gore everywhere he went. Several groups, ranging from college students denouncing the scandal around financing from Tibetan Buddhists, to a group called the "Potheads for Gore," began to expose Gore to ridicule. The humor used by these demonstrators finally created a situation in which some of the news media began to cover some of the numerous lies which Gore told at every campaign stop.

The combined effect of these interventions, was that among both the population and the news media, Gore was increasingly portrayed as a vicious liar, who is willing to say anything in order to get elected. LaRouche Democrats also sparked the environment in which the Bill Bradley's campaign finally began to fight back against Gore. In the debate between Gore and Bradley in Manchester on Jan. 26 (LaRouche was not allowed to participate), Bradley asked, "How can people expect you to tell the truth as President, if you don't tell the truth as a candidate?"

Although the Bradley assault was far weaker than what is necessary to effectively confront Gore's lies, it was immediately picked up by media around the New England region. Suddenly, the situation had changed. The attempt to package the election, and only discuss the "issues" in a fake and impotent way, had begun to crack.

### Where's the beef?

Despite this change though, serious politics has yet to be discussed in the year 2000 election campaign, except by LaRouche. Gore has been exposed as a liar, and Bradley has begun to use that fact to defend himself from Gore's attacks. However, due to the media blackout being run against the third major Democratic candidate, LaRouche, the debate is still centered around a false, and dangerous view of the U.S. economy, and a complete lack of attention to the strategic crisis facing the world today.

The absurd notion that the United States is in the "greatest economic upswing ever" is still the basis for the debate. No one is dealing with the reality of the financial crisis which this country and the world face, and the media are doing their best to keep it that way. The closest thing to reality in the debate, is the laudable goal promoted by the Bradley campaign, of "health care for all." Unfortunately, Bradley does not seem to understand what it would really take to achieve such a goal: a reversal of the post-industrial looting of the U.S. economy, and a reorganization of the financial system, which would allow the creation of the credit necessary to rebuild the U.S. health-care system.

As for international policy, there is practically no debate at all. When the candidates do say something about foreign policy, it is foolish, or worse. The Republicans, for example, seem to be running a contest as to who can more effectively threaten China and block a partnership for economic development among the leading nations of the world. On the Democratic side, Gore goes around boasting of his relationship with Russian mafia-king and former Prime Minister Viktor Chernenyrdin.

Thus, there is still no debate on substantive issues, due to both the control exercised by the media, and the virtual reality in which many American citizens live. Two examples show how this works. First, during a forum in Manchester on Jan. 26, various media personalities discussed how well or poorly the media are covering the campaign. When asked about

Gore's lying on civil rights, and about the blackout against LaRouche, not one person spoke to the question. They just ignored it, and moved on to the next questioner. Second, this reporter had a very difficult time engaging in intelligent conversation with Gore supporters. Most political activists will defend their candidate, and their ideas, when confronted. Many Gore supporters, though, when asked about Gore's record, simply went blank, and refused to discuss anything at all.

Still, in New Hampshire, the attempt to rig the U.S. Presidential election was severely set back. The front-runners Bush and Gore are suddenly in big trouble, and the population is not buying their pre-packaged, made-for-TV, campaigns. The fact that Gore is a compulsive liar is now out in the open, and has become a topic of conversation among voters.

## Election thuggery from Bush and Gore

by Michele Steinberg

On Feb. 2, one day after George "Dubya" Bush was trounced in New Hampshire, with more than 69% of Republican Party voters casting ballots against him, Bush's campaign stipulated to "forgery and fraud" in a lawsuit brought by Steve Forbes over the signatures nominating Bush in New York's 16th Congressional District. As a result, Bush's name and delegates were thrown off the ballot in that district.

This dramatic defeat for the \$58 million Bush campaign occurred after two days of hearings in a New York court, where evidence of 300 cases of fraud was being presented against Bush. It comes at the same time that U.S. Federal District Court Judge Edward Korman is weighing a decision to overturn GOP primary rules, and place John McCain on the ballot in all districts in New York. McCain is on the ballot in 19 districts, but the Bush backers challenged and kicked him off in eight districts. But despite the scandal of the Bush forgeries, the media—with the exception of one report in the *New York Times* City Edition—has largely avoided the Bush fraud.

Now, the dam has burst. After the New Hampshire defeat, "Boy George" (as he's being called by Washington critics after his Mommy and Daddy campaigned for "my boy" in New Hampshire), is finding that his attempt to keep McCain off the ballot in New York, using the Republican Party machine, is backfiring, and Bush is scrambling to blame the whole mess on the New Yorkers.

### Fraud!

With the political tide turning as a result of New Hampshire, things could get even worse for Bush. On Feb. 3, Bush's