

# Vote Fraud? How AIPAC Lieberman 'Won'

By Karl WB Schwarz  
11-11-6

We may have the clearest evidence of vote fraud coming out of Connecticut with the re-election of Pro-Israel Joe Lieberman as an Independent.  
<http://www.rumormillnews.com/cgi-bin/forum.cgi?read=95480> Now, how exactly did Lieberman win TWO elections and his two opponents got exactly the SAME number of votes at exactly 448,077 votes each time?!?! "In Connecticut Ned Lamont (Dem.) lost EXACTLY with THE SAME number of votes as did Phil Giordano (Rep.) collected in 2000." Any of you mathematical geniuses want to calculate the odds on that? It is beyond staggering. It is statistically IMPOSSIBLE and could not happen twice in one million years, much less twice in 6 years for one lucky Pro-Israel Jewish Senator. I think this matter needs to be investigated because it is smoking hot and beyond outrageous.

How Lieberman 'Beat' Anti-War Candidate Lamont In Connecticut

From James Morris

AIPAC and NeoCon (War for Israel) Policy <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4Rf16XjbOUs> ISRAELI SPY RING PROBE WIDENS  
<http://la.indymedia.org/news/2006/11/187362.php>

Stephen Sniegowski wrote:

Jim,

The Lieberman victory is extremely significant. He now has great national importance as an "independent" and he retains his seniority in the Democratic Party. He can blackmail the Democrats to get what he wants; and the pro-Zionist Senate leadership wants to give in to him. Obviously, David Duke could not command such power if he were in Lieberman's position.

Reasons For Victory

Popularity because of Name Recognition Unfortunately, Lieberman, as an independent, was ahead of Lamont in the polls from the time he lost the primary to Lamont. Lieberman did get 48 percent of the primary vote. That was the official reason why Lieberman chose to run.

Zionist Money And Support

Also Lieberman received extensive support from billionaire New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg

[http://seattletimes.nwsourc.com/html/nationworld/2003328796\\_joe29.html?syndicationfiltered=rss](http://seattletimes.nwsourc.com/html/nationworld/2003328796_joe29.html?syndicationfiltered=rss)

It is possible that others of Bloomberg's ilk might have provided substantial financial support for Lieberman.

#### Weak Candidate

The Republicans ran a weak candidate, as you pointed out. Exit polls showed Lieberman winning with more than two-thirds of the Republican vote and one-third of the Democrats. <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/11/09/nyregion/09conn.html>

#### Seniority And Pork

From the get-go Harry Reid supposedly promised Lieberman that he would retain his seniority. Lieberman stated he would retain his seniority. Running the Committee on Homeland Security he can hand out money to Connecticut big wigs. Lamont would be in an important possible and could not bring in nearly as much pork.

[http://www.tpmcafe.com/blog/electioncentral/2006/aug/18/ct\\_sen\\_courant\\_says\\_dems\\_might\\_drop\\_joe](http://www.tpmcafe.com/blog/electioncentral/2006/aug/18/ct_sen_courant_says_dems_might_drop_joe)

#### Lamont Got Virtually No Help From The National Democratic Party

Lamont has received almost no money from the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee (DSCC) and only token contributions from Senate Democrats' political action committees. The only support has been nominal.

[http://www.hillnews.com/thehill/export/TheHill/News/Campaign/110106\\_lamont.html](http://www.hillnews.com/thehill/export/TheHill/News/Campaign/110106_lamont.html)

[Disclaimer](#)

[Email This Article](#)

---

**[MainPage](#)**

<http://www.rense.com>

**[This Site Served by TheHostPros](#)**