

Brian Fitzhugh <fitzbr65@yahoo.com> wrote:
Date: Tue, 9 Nov 2004 21:54:17 -0800 (PST)

. . . and the mighty Wurlitzer plays on
Brian Fitzhugh

At the risk of defying the post-election mood which tells us "the people have spoken," and "This is not 2000" and "time to move on" and "no one likes a whiner or sore loser", I will nevertheless raise the topic of election fraud. In the light of clear and irrefutable statistical anomalies correlating almost perfectly with electronic voting machines so wisely designed without paper audit trails, there is more than enough reason for a thorough investigation. The variations are so odd (in size) and so consistently favoring one candidate, that they have never been seen in the history of election analysis. And the pattern is not present at all where voting machines with paper audit trails are used.

Is the mainstream press covering this story? It just seems to me that any major news outlet that questions election results in the current environment is likely to find itself on Fox News facing charges of being a sore loser, a divider, or of refusing to accept "the clear message that America has sent." (Mandate used here to mean a sizable majority.) It appears as if they are afraid of being Ratherized. I must admit that setting him up with "phony" documents completely removed attention from the contents which were avowed by those involved to be genuine. Rather, let's talk about the type font not existing at the time they were created. No one can say that Karl Rove is not a master at the Wurlitzer. Actually the story was first pointed out by the Bush people themselves. The story being the very strange variations of late day exits polls with the tallied results. Such large errors in a few critical states have never been seen before.

The Bushites claimed this as evidence of the "biased media" purposefully trying to influence last minute voters. If that indeed was the source of these anomalies, then the anti-Bush plotters must get the award for all time miscalculation and dumbest scheme ever devised. The old story goes, that if one is going to pad the results of an election, don't make it close as that will surely result in demands of a recount. Karl said that years ago in Texas. Exit polls are historically within a point or two of the results and they were where paper trail audits were in place.

"George W. Bush's vote tallies, especially in the key state of Florida, are so statistically stunning that they border on the unbelievable."

"Bush took turnout throughout the state to a new level, testing the bounds of statistical probability by winning votes seemingly from every corner of the state. If Bush's totals weren't artificially enhanced, they would represent one of the most remarkable electoral achievements in U.S. history."

"While it's conceivable Bush might have achieved these and other gains through his hardball campaign strategies, many Americans, looking at these and other statistically incredible Bush vote counts, suspect that the Republicans put a thumb on the electoral scales, somehow

exaggerating Bush's tallies through manipulation of computer tabulations."

"Only an open-minded investigation with public scrutiny would have much hope of quelling these rising suspicions."

So when you say you do not want to hear anymore about it and that whining is unbecoming, be sure that you are not being mesmerized by Karl's organ music as you watch this flick. For more information on "The Mighty Wurlitzer" just keep reading.

"The Mighty Wurlitzer" essays on disinformation and propagandaby
Michael Finley

The Mighty Wurlitzer takes its name from the theater organs of the 1920s that told people how to feel about the movie on the screen. The term was first coined by the CIA. Nowadays, it stands for a many-headed disinformation network starting with purveyors of Internet gossip and right-wing talk-radio jocks and partisan outlets like FOX, and expanding to include "legitimate" news outlets like CBS and the Washington Post. The Mighty Wurlitzer has so many pipes and ranks that it sometimes seems the truth has no chance against it.

Talking back to the Wurlitzer

It's not easy to stand up to the blasts of the Wurlitzer machine, which is so wonderfully adept at spinning disinformation, disseminating it to the public, and quashing rational discussion. So here are the telltale signs you are being buffaloeed, plus tips on how to help others talk back, too.

Do they habitually over-reach? The key to the Wurlitzer's is repetition ad nauseam. They don't just tell a lie. They tell it a thousand times until people cave in to it. The Wurlitzer equates protesters with "leftists," calls Democrats traitors. Al Gore a liar, and those who lament a stolen election are "sore losers." Losing an election, they nevertheless ram through an arch-conservative agenda, against the wishes of voters. The Wurlitzer never settles for half a loaf. It never muddles along. It has to win every battle. It never says "I'm sorry." This is their greatest vulnerability, because it is impossible to govern for long with compromise.

Do they count on our inconstancy? The Wurlitzer is more disciplined than we are. Americans are famously forgiving, with zephyr-like attention spans. They think you've forgotten about Ken Lay and the looting of Enron, about Harvey Pitt and the crippling of the SEC, about Trent Lott's love affair with segregation, about Cheney's energy task force, about Bush's own desertion from the service in the time of war. Keep score, and never forget.

Do they hide behind sacred objects? The flag. The troops. "Freedom." Anyone who opposes them opposes America. Point to the contradictions of civilians who never served in the armed forces, yet undermine our freedoms with unconstitutional actions and policies - and hide behind our soldiers, our flag, and our values.

Does a cloak of inevitability obscure thought? Bush chased GOP rivals out of the 2000 race by stressing his inevitability, and used it again in Florida during the recount, and when pushing his tax cuts for the rich through Congress. Finally, he used it to guarantee war in Iraq. Indeed, some say that inevitability was the actual war plan: Iraq, knowing it would lose, quickly surrendered. Rip down the cloak! It is merely a clever form of intimidation. Call attention to the ploy. Say, "They would not pretend their way is inevitable if it actually were; then it would be unnecessary."

Are they shameless at the bottom, yet deniable at the top? They let Drudge or Limbaugh or Hannity or Coulter or Sullivan put the worst lies and spin into play. It quickly seeps upward to a cooperative "legitimate" press. Throughout the mudfight the President stays clean. The President never says outright, "Saddam Hussein was to blame for September 11." But the Wurlitzer convinces 70% of Americans, and our entire armed forces, that it's true-- which it isn't. Make the President responsible for the lies his propaganda machine tells.

Do they play hardball when everyone else is playing softball? The administration uses "shock and awe" in politics as well as war, attacking people's characters, demonizing the opposition, planting the suggestion that opponents are unpatriotic, un-American, or "leftist." Clinton's presidency was destroyed by personal assassination. Gore's candidacy was destroyed by smears. Thousands have lost their jobs or been silenced by intimidation. Link arms. When a leader of the opposition is target for destruction (Clinton, Gore, Daschle, Kerry), back him up and demand that your representatives do likewise. Individually we can be broken; we can play hardball, too.

Do they shuffle rationales? Early on the objective was to find Osama bin Laden. When that became impossible, it was to liberate of Afghani women, whom they never cared about before. In Iraq it began the same way, with calls for regime change. Then it became a search for weapons of mass destruction. In another switch, it was to avenge 9/11. Only at the end did it become a gift to the people of Iraq. When the administration fails on one front, they switch objectives. Don't let them bait and switch.

Do they invent evidence and concoct statistics? How many times before and during the war were there reports of depleted uranium found, or supposed photographs of chemical weapons installations? Much of the evidence presented to the UN was cooked or copied from someone's term paper. Expose the deceptions. When you hear someone repeat false gossip, call them on it. "That was disproved."
"The anthrax was baking soda." "That's the piping of the Wurlitzer."

BF