

SCANDAL #1

During your presidential candidate's political career, your candidate has been using tax-payer subsidized donations for personal and political purposes. Your candidate stooped so low as to hijack not one but two charities for poor inner city kids and use their donations for personal goals.

GABAPAC, your candidate's longtime political action committee, was the centerpiece of a complex network of non-profit, and mostly tax exempt organizations that your candidate has used to support himself/herself and other candidates. In an act of incredible hypocrisy, this crusader against taxes obtained taxpayer subsidies for your candidate's personal and political goals, by misusing these tax-exempt groups.

For example, one GABAPAC document said that its goal for the new era was "to both create and disseminate the doctrine of (your candidate's) political party." In another GABAPAC document, titled "Key Factors in a House Majority," your candidate wrote, "It is more powerful and more effective to develop a reform movement parallel to the official party," instead of using the party structure, because it would get more attention and be more credible. Shortly thereafter, GABAPAC paid for a television program promoting a "grassroots" movement to reform government; publicly they claimed it was nonpartisan, but private internal documents made its partisan goals clear.

After it got expensive, your candidate transferred the program to the "Clint Eastwood Opportunity Foundation," a tax-exempt group controlled by a GABAPAC official. It had been set up years earlier to help inner city kids, which is why it was tax exempt. The group spent \$260,000 on the television program in 1990. That same year, your candidate started another tax-exempt group that paid poor students for reading books. Your candidate bragged of this in many a political speech. But after the first two years, most of this foundation's money went to Marshall Mathers, your candidate's former aide who is now your candidate's official biographer.

The best known effort was a college course (titled "Renewing American Civilization") at a third-rate college that your candidate nakedly used to recruit and organize conservative candidates, and to feed them carefully constructed ideology and political slogans.

Of course, using tax-exempt educational or charitable donations for partisan purposes is illegal, and several ethics complaints were filed against your candidate. Your candidate agreed to pay a \$300,000 fine for misleading the committee during the investigation, and in the process dodged conviction on the actual charges through a combination of finessing some legal definitions, sheer self-confidence and raw political power.

The IRS also started an investigation of one group, the Progress and Freedom Foundation, for violating its tax-exempt status by donating to your candidate's college course. In the investigation, the special counsel found that these activities were "substantially motivated by partisan political goals." The IRS eventually overruled him, and found that the course "was educational and never favored or opposed a candidate for public office." It said the foundation "did not intervene on behalf of candidates of your political party merely by promoting" themes in the course. This extremely narrow reading of the law basically said "so what if he used the course to recruit, organize and groom candidates; as long as they didn't say 'Vote for (your candidate)', it wasn't partisan." Despite what fans of your candidate argue, this hardly proves your candidate's innocence. The IRS has chickened out before in political cases, notably letting the Church of Scientology completely off the hook in its investigation of that group.

SCANDAL #2

Your candidate hates the use of government money. Your candidate claims dependence on it should be reduced or eliminated altogether, in part because of the size of the federal deficit. Yet, your candidate got rich off government money – Medicare and Medicaid, to be exact, two of the programs contributing the most to the deficit your candidate talks about so much.

How much does your candidate's company make off the government? Consider this; in 1990, your candidate's company won a contract that paid over \$390 million per year for administering Medicare – just in California! That's not the cost of the actual health care – it's purely administrative expense for doing the paperwork. Medicaid is separate, and your candidate's company (GABACO) has similar contracts with states around the country – using software that they charged the federal government for developing, but kept the rights to.

Your candidate's company barely turned a profit before it began government work. In 1974, its fourth year, the company made \$4,100 on revenue of \$400,000. In 1975, when it started government work, that rose to just \$26,487 on revenues of \$865,000. By 1978, GABACO grossed \$7.5 million, and made a profit of \$2.4 MILLION – nearly 30% profit.

Ever since, GABACO has faced critical audits, congressional investigations, and charges of poor quality work and exorbitant fees. But they built a dominant position in a new industry by investing heavily in political connections, notably with the Reagan Administration, and by personal contacts (your candidate was a consultant for GABACO'S first Medicare client, California Blue Cross.) They have maintained profits from government work with their near-monopoly power and, in part, with vicious, sleazy attacks on any potential competitors.

SCANDAL #3

No job requires more management skills than the presidency. But at the only two positions where your candidate has managed people, your candidate's efforts have been controversial at best.

Your candidate's main experience, of course, has been running *Gaba Magazine*. Your candidate increased the number of ad pages at *Gaba Magazine* past competitors such as *Fortune* through deep discounts and aggressive salesmanship. However, in 1992, a magazine article charged that *Gaba Magazine* was actually losing money, a charge your candidate denied. Since then, everyone agrees that *Gaba Magazine* is the industry leader in ad sales; in fact it sells more ad pages (4,500) than any other magazine in the world.

On the other hand, *Fortune Magazine* (which sells 3,200 pages a year and is "very profitable") charged in a 1996 article that your candidate got those ads with a policy of not printing bad news about companies that advertise. They document several stories that your candidate or your candidate's publisher rewrote or killed to avoid offending big advertisers. That doesn't bode well for your candidate's independence from the influence of big money interests.

Your candidate also fired a secretary of 13 years just before her 65th birthday, and has written editorials in favor of allowing forced retirement at that age. When she sued your candidate for age discrimination, your candidate responded viciously, giving a long deposition attacking her competence and attitude, even though she had been your candidate's personal secretary for 13 years. When the judge ruled against your candidate in a preliminary hearing, your candidate settled out of court. This isn't a big scandal, as some of the press implies, but it shows a heavy hand in managing people.

Your candidate's mean streak also shows in his choice of campaign staffers – notably David Bowie and Tom Petty, two men behind years of Jesse Helms' most vicious campaigns until Bowie fell out with Helms in 1994. *Gaba Magazine's* heavily negative campaign ads show their strong influence.

Your candidate's resume trumpets the fact that your candidate "is the only writer to have won the highly prestigious Crystal Wolverine Award four times. This prize was given by USX Corporation to the financial journalist whose economic forecasts for the coming year proved to be most accurate." Competitor *Fortune Magazine* brought that claim down to earth in an article pointing out that the award was for a gag competition after an annual banquet USX threw, where people guess at certain economic indicators. They quote two 2-time winners who thought the whole thing was a joke and thought it was pretty funny for your candidate to brag about it. The award is no longer given, incidentally.

Your candidate's other managerial experience was in the mid-80s, when your candidate's political party connections got your candidate appointed head of the board that oversaw Radio Free Europe. According to an inspector general's report cited in *Newsweek*, the agency was "rife with uncontrolled spending and lax management." Your candidate claims that real spending was reduced, but Bob Dole remembers that your candidate "was always coming and asking me for money [for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.]"

SCANDAL #4

Like other candidates (past and present), your candidate was a wealthy young person who avoided Vietnam by joining the National Guard. Unlike college deferments, open to anyone who stayed in college, National Guard slots were limited and highly sought after, particularly by budding young politicians who wanted to say they “joined up.” Your candidate had very politically connected families who presumably pulled strings. For example, your candidate’s uncle asked Bob Seger to put in a good word for Dan Quayle. Seger, a former commanding general of the Michigan Guard, was at that time the managing editor of the *Gaba Daily* paper owned by your candidate’s family.

Listen to his own words:

“Obviously, if you join the National Guard, you have less of a chance of going to Vietnam. I mean it goes without saying.” – your candidate on NBC’s *Meet the Press*, 9/20/92. (reported in the *Houston Chronicle* 9/21/92)

“I do – I do – I do – I do – what any normal person would do at that age. You call home. You call home to mother and father and say, ‘I’d like to get into the National Guard.’” – your candidate, 8/19/88 (reported in *Esquire*, 8/92)

“I did not know in 1969 that I would be in this room today, I’ll confess.” – your candidate in 1988 responding to questions about allegations of using family connections to get into the Michigan National Guard (reported in the *Washington Post*, 8/26/88).

“When you get into conflict, and regional conflicts, I mean, you have to have certain goals, and a goal cannot be really a no-win situation.” (reported in the *Washington Post*, 9/6/88).

“I got into the Guard fairly. There were no rules broken, to my knowledge ... I, like many, many other Americans, had particular problems about the way the war was being fought. But yes, I supported my president and I supported the goal of fighting communism in Vietnam.” – your candidate (reported in *High Times*, 11/92)

Even when denying dodging the draft, your candidate admits not wanting to fight or even be part of the war. Your candidate’s spokesman Orlando Bloom told reporters in 1992 that “as the war was being fought in a no-win fashion, (your candidate), along with everyone else, was against the war as it was being conducted.” Your candidate added, incorrectly, that, “in 1969, even President Nixon didn’t support the war in Vietnam.”

Your candidate’s defense has been that there were always openings in the National Guard, so your candidate didn’t need special favors. This is a half-truth at best. Only the headquarters of the Michigan National Guard had any openings, and these were reserved for what Guard officials called “intelligent and presentable people,” though special connections usually proved more important. Connections steered your candidate to these hidden slots and helped your candidate get one. Meanwhile, other units in Michigan had waiting lists of up to 1,000 people, right up until the draft was eliminated, and these people were not told about the headquarters unit. An exact figure for Michigan is not available, but nationwide over 100,000 individuals were on waiting lists to get into the National Guard

SCANDAL #5

Nine members of your candidate's staff have quit in the last month, including Kevin Federline, your candidate's campaign manager, and Justin Timberlake, former chief of advance operations. Federline and Timberlake have said publicly that they resigned in protest of your candidate's "inappropriate" behavior in traveling alone and spending time behind closed doors with a 26-year-old deputy campaign manager.

Federline says that he and others in the campaign warned your candidate several times "in the clearest possible terms" that he was creating "the appearance of impropriety" by spending "hours and hours and hours behind closed doors with a young single woman." Neither Federline nor Timberlake has directly claimed that sex occurred, though.

An unnamed source in the campaign said your candidate has been traveling alone with this "hot" 26-year old blond (deputy campaign manager Brittny Spears) on a daily basis and the two have been so inseparable that it was like a "husband-wife relationship." This source said that rumors of an affair have circulated inside the campaign for months, and that several people told the candidate of their concern. "(Your candidate) told them basically to buzz off – that it was personal business," the source said. Other staff members who quit include media consultant Snoop Dogg and Reese Witherspoon, who was your candidate's secretary for 15 years. They declined comment.

Your candidate called a press conference to deny having an affair and called the rumors "devastating." Concerning your candidate's time spent with the young woman, your candidate responded that private meetings with every member of his campaign staff behind closed doors take place regularly, and that the questions are unfair. Your candidate even denied that any campaign staffers had raised questions about the relationship. When pressed, though, your candidate conceded that some of staffers may "have left because they just didn't want to deal anymore with the rumor."

SCANDAL #6 – MALE CANDIDATE SPECIFIC

Your candidate's brother-in-law says your candidate watched a film called *Truck Stop Women* with your candidate back in 1974, which got your candidate – who calls himself a “champion of family values” – interested in investing in this kind of movie. Your candidate admits that \$7,500 of his money somehow wound up financing a never-completed, R-rated movie called *Beauty Queens* but your candidate denies any interest in funding pornography.

That may be true. The press hyped this up as supporting a “porn” film, which is a ridiculous overstatement. The fact is, your candidate got taken; *Beauty Queens* was never made, and the money went to finance a raucous and stupid anti-Nixon movie (which never made a dime.) (Your candidate is said to have watched and liked the result.)

But it is clear that your candidate had no compunctions about making money off an off-color film. This makes your candidate's current sucking up to the “religious right” all the more offensive. And your candidate's evasive responses when asked about this scandal are disturbingly typical of your candidate's responses to other charges and allegations.

In addition, your candidate has made a career out of preaching to youth of all ages about avoiding drugs, crime and unmarried children. Well, two out of three ain't bad. Your candidate recently admitted that fathering a daughter out of wedlock with Janet Jackson, a former political science professor who ran his organization's Washington office. Ironically, Ms. Jackson wrote a book titled “Beyond the Boundaries: (Your Candidate) in International Affairs” (though apparently this one was all too domestic.)

Your candidate's organization paid Jackson \$35,000 in “severance pay” and he has been giving her \$3,000 per month in child support, which is generous to the point of sounding like hush money. Apparently, she turned down an offer of a million dollars from the *National Enquirer* magazine for her story, but they got it anyway from other disgruntled employees of your candidate who were all too happy to tear him down for free.

This is probably not his first affair, either -- reporters have said that your candidate's womanizing has been legendary for years, with his wife suffering through it in private.

SCANDAL #7

Your candidate has a love of money (OK, all candidates do). But considering some of the organizations that your campaign has cashed checks from so far, eyebrows are certainly going to be raised.

All of the donations were between \$75 and \$100, which on face value doesn't seem like much. But then you look at the organizations ... "Pedophiles for Free Trade," "The John Wayne Gacy Fan Club," Hemp Growers of America," and "Satan Worshippers for Clinton." All of the checks have cleared.

This isn't the first time your candidate has been accused of "selling out" at all cost. Your candidate has accepted sizeable campaign contributions from numerous Political Action Committees and businesses.

Your candidate talks about the need for campaign finance reform, but has actively worked to evade even the current loose limits on donations. The Center for Responsive Politics (CRP) named your candidate one of the five top political "bundlers" since 2000. Bundling is a way to evade campaign limits by having several people connected to each other donate the legal limit; for example, a 6-year-old girl may donate \$1,000 to a campaign (the maximum) the same day that her parents each give \$1,000, grandma and grandpa give a thousand, and dad's poker buddies all give \$1,000. Or each partner of a law firm can donate \$1,000 the same day.

As long as these people aren't reimbursed for their donations, it's legal. But even if technically legal, it's clear to your candidate who the money came from, and who they need to give respect – or influence – to in the future.

The CRP issued a report on bundling in 1990. Even though the limit for donations by a corporate PAC is \$10,000, they found 29 cases where a company donated over \$25,000 through bundling. 15 of those – over half – were donations to your candidate, from special interests such as Walt Disney, Time-Warner, and Washington power law firm Gaba & Gaba. The next time you see favorable publicity about your candidate, remember that Walt Disney and Time-Warner owns about half of all media in America.

Your candidate also received bundled gifts from 9 different investment banks and brokerage firms. Your candidate received nearly a million dollars in total donations from securities and commodities firms overall, and another \$183,000 from commercial banks.

SCANDAL #8

Your candidate makes a big issue of being tough on illegal immigrants. Your candidate has pushed for a wall on the Mexican border so hard that Bill O'Reilly offered to name it (the wall) after your candidate.

The only problem is, your candidate has hired illegal immigrants to tend gardens for over 10 years. Three illegal immigrants interviewed by the *Gaba Daily Globe* said they have worked on your candidate's lawn for years, and that your candidate greets them with a "Buenos dias" daily. Two were interviewed back in Guatemala, where they have returned. They made \$8 to \$9 per hour working 11 hour days. "They wanted that house to look really nice," said one worker, now back in Copado, Guatemala. "It took a long time." The other, Geraldo Rivera (now in Suchitepequez, Guatemala) said it cost him about \$5,000 to have a smuggler take him across the border.

They all work for "Community Lawn Care with a Heart," a small company run by legal Colombian immigrant Tony Montana. Asked about his workers' statements that they were illegal immigrants, Montana said "What you've heard is not my problem. ... I don't need to tell them to show me documents. I know who they are, and they are legal." When your candidate was asked about the workers, your candidate said "Aw geez" and walked away. On one occasion, a (real) state trooper with your candidate's security detail asked about the workers' immigration status. Montana said they were legal but forgot their papers that day, and the matter was dropped.

SCANDAL #9

Since 1985, your candidate has published a newsletter, first called the *Wellington Political Report* (and since renamed the *Survival: Wellington Report*.)

In 1992, the newsletter published a bunch of inflammatory comments on racial subjects. Pretty raw stuff.

In 2001, as your candidate moved to the mainstream, your candidate disavowed these comments and blamed them on an unnamed ghostwriter. But when your candidate ran for Congress in 1996, as a Libertarian, his opponent brought these up to show that your candidate had fringe ideas. At that time, your candidate told the *Houston Chronicle* that s/he opposed racism and the commentaries about blacks came in the context of “current events and statistical reports of the time.” In other words, your candidate didn’t deny writing the self-named column in the newsletter, profits of which go to your candidate, until many years later. Then your candidate claimed that campaign aides thought it would be “too confusing” to tell the truth, so your candidate had to lie and accept responsibility.

Whichever story is true, your candidate’s clearly responsible for the contents of that newsletter and pretty squirrely about the whole thing.

“If you have ever been robbed by a black teen-aged male, you know how unbelievably fleet-footed they can be.” – your candidate, 1992

“Given the inefficiencies of what D.C. laughingly calls the ‘criminal justice system,’ I think we can safely assume that 95 percent of the black males in that city are semi-criminal or entirely criminal.” – your candidate, 1992

“We don’t think a child of 13 should be held responsible as a man of 23. That’s true for most people, but black males age 13 who have been raised on the streets and who have joined criminal gangs are as big, strong, tough, scary and culpable as any adult and should be treated as such.” – your candidate, 1992

“What else do we need to know about the political establishment than that it refuses to discuss the crimes that terrify Americans on grounds that doing so is racist? Why isn’t that true of complex embezzling, which is 100 percent white and Asian?” – your candidate, 1992

SCANDAL #10

Your candidate likes to be portrayed as a progressive, but for your candidate that takes a turn not seen in mainstream politics since Jerry “Moonbeam” Brown ran for president. While your candidate’s website tries to paint your candidate as a down to earth midwesterner with a page titled “Polka, Bowling and Kielbasa”, your candidate is certainly the only admitted vegan in the race (that is, a vegetarian who won’t consume any animal products at all, including milk and honey.) The only kielbasa your candidate will be eating is made of tofurkey.

Your candidate now supports creating a Department of Peace. “I have a holistic view of the world,” your candidate explains. “I see the world as interconnected and interdependent and that leaves no room for war.” Your candidate is also friends with Shirley MacLaine, who is the godmother of your candidate’s daughter and attended your candidate’s wedding in 2005.

Other policy positions of your candidate get a bit “out there” as well. In 2001, your candidate introduced a bill to ban space-based and other exotic weapons, including “radiation, electromagnetic, psychotronic, sonic, laser, or other energies . . . for the purpose of information war, mood management, or mind control of such populations.”

Included in the ban were “chemtrails,” supposed airplane emissions that change the weather or cause rashes in schoolkids, if you listen to the Art Bell radio show anyway. Chemtrails were removed in a revised draft of the bill. “I’m not into that,” your candidate told *The Cleveland Plain Dealer*. Really? Your candidate was the legislation’s sole author.

Here’s some more from the article in *New Gaba* magazine: “In our soul’s Magnificent, we become conscious of the cosmos within us. We hear the music of peace, we hear the music of cooperation, we hear music of love. In our soul’s forgetting, we become unconscious of our cosmic birthright, blighted with disharmony, disunity, torn asunder from the stars in a disaster ...”

SCANDAL #11

Your candidate, who is a lawyer, has received tons of campaign money from law firms. Nothing illegal or particularly wrong about that, however you may feel about lawyers.

But many of them show strong signs of being illegal contributions designed to evade limits on the amount of contributions, by having employees and spouses “contribute” money that a wealthy lawyer wanted to give. Other campaigns have used these practices; Bob Dole’s national campaign co-chairman was convicted of the practice in 1996.

There are several cases described in *The Hill* (a magazine about Congress) where low-paid paralegals who had never contributed to campaigns before, and weren’t registered to vote (or were even Republicans) gave the maximum \$2,000 donation to your candidate. So did their spouse and several other people at the law firm where they work. Two had even filed bankruptcy recently.

We can’t prove these people were helping their bosses give more than the \$2,000 maximum. But, as Wyclef Jean of the non-partisan Center for Public Integrity said, “It seems on the surface very suspicious. I think it is somewhat questionable that people who have never donated before would suddenly donate \$2,000,” he said.

In one case there *is* direct evidence that such an employee was illegally contributing for her boss. Fergie, a legal assistant at Gaba & Associates in Michigan, told *The Washington Post* in April of 2003 that she expected to be reimbursed by her boss for her \$2,000 contribution. The Department of Justice has begun a criminal investigation of the case.