

Among others speaking at the conference: G. William Miller, chairman of the Federal Reserve; Barry Bosworth, head of the President's Council on Wage and Price Stability; Presidential Special Advisor on Inflation Robert Strauss; Ray Marshall and William Usery, respectively present and former Secretaries of Labor; Robert Abboud, chief

executive officer of the First National Bank of Chicago; Thomas Murphy, chairman of General Motors; former United Steelworkers president I.W. Abel; and Jerry Wurf, current president of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees.

The Michigan vote fraud machine

Although the Michigan chapter of the U.S. Labor Party has brought a suit in federal court challenging the actions of the Michigan state board of elections in the new third party qualification primary there, and is demanding to be placed on the ballot in that state, the

ELECTIONS

real story of vote fraud and the machine which controls it in Michigan has yet to be told.

Last week U.S. District Court Judge James Harvey denied the Labor Party's motion despite evidence, uncontested by the USLP's opponents in the case, that in three counties at least 3,300 Labor Party votes were uncounted. This projects to 30,000 missing votes statewide. Only 4,200 are required for ballot status. Virtually all the votes had been invalidated because voters were misled into believing that the third party qualification vote was a referendum section of the ballot, and ended up splitting their tickets. In the city of Flint, 488 of the 496 Labor Party votes were disqualified that way.

Judge Harvey ruled that "the voting instructions and procedure for placing a new political party on the November ballot were not so deceptive as to make it *impossible* for a voter, desiring to place a new political party on the November ballot, to register his vote accordingly" (emphasis added). Judge Harvey also ruled that "Ordering the plaintiffs to be placed on the November ballot would contribute to voter confusion and the overcrowding and clogging of the state election machinery. . . ."

His ruling came after three days of testimony, unrefuted by the State Election Board, that the ballot design and voting procedure was so complicated that only the most ardently partisan and devoted Labor Party supporter would be able to register his vote; that local election officials had been systematically misinformed about the nature of the election and systematically misinformed voters, resulting in split tickets. Why did Judge Harvey ignore three days of testimony and the flood of discounted ballots?

The election system in the state of Michigan is part of a political machine jointly controlled by the United Auto Workers and Max Fisher, a representative of the Bronfman-organized "crime-gone-respectable" networks. The UAW runs the local government machinery and controls the Democratic Party. Fisher, a close friend of Henry Kissinger, controls the Republican Party through his role as its chief fundraiser, as well as the Republican side of the state government, and exerts considerable influence in industry. Together, they run a vote fraud machine.

By 1974 an uncontrollable element was introduced into Michigan politics — the U.S. Labor Party. USLP Detroit city council candidate Susan Ketcham that year won more than 6,000 votes in the November election. The UAW filed a \$30 million lawsuit against the U.S. Labor Party and its newspaper *New Solidarity*. Sustained Detroit police surveillance, intimidation, harassment and petty arrests were unsuccessful in dislodging growing Labor Party influence. By 1976, with a presidential campaign coming up, the vote fraud machine went into action to write the Labor Party out of Michigan politics.

UAW-backed state legislators McCullough and Sheridan were encouraged to file legislation calling for a separate, third party qualification primary to be run, in which any new party would have to win .3% of the total vote cast statewide in the primary. The bill was drafted by Deputy State Election Director McGowan, a disbarred lawyer who had been sponsored for his State Election Board position by Lawrence Linderman, former Democratic Party State Chairman.

The State Board of Elections then announced that they were going to be unable to conduct the 1976 election because eleven parties (two more than the maximum that could be accommodated on Michigan voting machines) were applying for ballot status. (The State Board of Elections has been unable to produce any documentation to substantiate that assertion and now claims merely that eleven parties made inquiries about obtaining ballot status). Sheridan and McCullough proposed that, in view of the emergency, ballot access in 1976 be determined by a third party qualification primary. State Attorney

General Frank Kelly issued an opinion that such a law would be unconstitutional if applied to only one election. McCullough and Sheridan then amended their bill so that it would apply henceforth.

State Election Director Bernard Apol admitted later in court that the only purpose of the bill, which was claimed to insure parties had "a modicum of community support," was to keep third parties off the ballot. Although the law was upheld by the federal courts, dissenting Judge John Feikens indicated that the legislative conspiracy was not dissimilar to that which had been the target of the 1960s Civil Rights Act.

Once the law was enacted, the same conspirators at the state level went into action along with their local, UAW-controlled election officials. The State Election Board carefully designed an incomprehensible ballot, insuring that the voter who discovered his party listed would still have only a modest chance of getting his vote registered. Then the State Election Board refused to disseminate any material educating poll workers or the public on the new election procedure. Most poll workers assumed that the third party qualification was a referendum section of the ballot, causing thousands and thousands of split tickets and spoiled ballots. The Labor Party discovered that between 50 percent and 600 percent of the votes recorded for it in different election jurisdictions were thrown out as invalid.

However, the confusion itself was merely a screen for orchestrated fraud. The State Board of Elections carefully failed to provide the Labor Party with a candidate code which must be used by election officials to match correctly the votes recorded on the back of the voting machine with the spot on the tally sheet on which they must be recorded. Sixty of eighty-three Michigan counties therefore initially reported *no* third party qualification returns.

In Wayne County, and other urban areas in which the Labor Party's electoral strength is primarily represented, vote fraud is a built in feature. There the election officials are drawn straight from the UAW's political action group CAP. The CAP graduate election officials have provided the UAW with almost complete control over elections in these areas. In this year's race in Wayne County two independent, non-UAW endorsed candidates ran for County Commissioner seats in the Democratic primary. One, a well known and respected area politician, was leading the race five to one.

As the election returns were coming in UAW Area One CAP official Bard Young began to pound the table and then left to make a series of phone calls. Then returns began to arrive from a largely black, UAW controlled town. The independent candidate lost the election by more than 1000 votes. The second independent candidate, endorsed by the NAACP and black church groups, won a negligible number of votes in the all black, UAW run township. (When the two independents asked for a recount, they received more

than twenty threats from area trade unionists, all advising them to "lay off.")

The Labor Party slate experienced similar fraud within Detroit City itself. Some Labor Party candidates were even credited with *no* votes in their home precincts! Hundreds of affidavits received from Labor Party voters indicated many more areas in which the Labor Party's vote was simply never counted.

At the top

In the face of such evidence how did Judge Harvey, a conservative judge with a reputation for respecting individual liberties, refuse to place the Labor Party on the ballot and refuse to grant any further inspection of voting machines or computer ballots?

The main reason, according to the aide to a Republican state politician, is the power of Max Fisher and his friend Henry Kissinger. "We can't get involved," he said. "You are pointing the finger at our major fundraiser." Henry Kissinger was the featured speaker at a major Republican fundraiser just five days before Judge Harvey's decision. Kissinger, while in Michigan at that time, also met with Max Fisher.

Kissinger, according to a number of reliable corporate sources, at that time was creating a major stir to contain Labor Party influence among businessmen. He and local operatives who are particularly associated with him through the Zionist Lobby — like Fisher, the Bronfmans, ADL-linked labor bureaucrats, and others have a long, documented history of attempting to undermine and stop the Labor Party's organizing. The Michigan vote fraud effort, undertaken for the same end, has brought the entire machine dangerously close to complete exposure.

— Felice Gelman

Flint Journal: Law sets unreasonable requirements

"Flint ballot check reveals U.S. Labor Party support," Flint Journal, Sept. 15:

A check of punch-card ballots from 48 Flint precincts Thursday revealed that 496 Flint residents voted for the U.S. Labor Party in the Aug. 8 primary.

Only eight of these ballots officially were tallied because the other 488 voters voided their partisan ballots by voting for more than one party. . . .

If that figure is projected for all of Genesee County, about 3,100 votes may have been cast for the minority party. That compares with 37 valid ballots officially reported for the primary, (County Clerk Michael Carr said.

Editorial, "Invalidate the law," Flint Journal, Sept. 17:

The U.S. Labor Party's court fight to get Michigan's "party qualification" law declared unconstitutional

How fraud affects the political process

In an official statement issued Sept. 23, U.S. Labor Party chairman Lyndon LaRouche denounced the Harvey ruling as making "republican democracy a thing of the past in Michigan." An extract of LaRouche's comments follows:

The Labor Party voters are concentrated among trade unionists, members of the black minority, and professionals concerned with U.S. general scientific and technological progress. The Labor Party vote was in fact a minority within groups of voters whose majorities vote for Republican or Democratic candidates but who are inclined toward the kinds of world-outlook and policies which the Labor Party voters support. Taken together, these voters represent a large chunk of the electorate.

Those voters who vote for Democratic and Republican candidates are sometimes gaining good representation by the particular candidate, but are more often only one constituency to which their candidate of choice is responding. Their candidate of choice does not consistently represent them, but they prefer a 20 percent piece of an elected official to a hundred percent piece of an unelected candidate.

Under these conditions, the suppression of a 5-to-30 percent actual Labor Party vote through vote-fraud conspiracy (as in Michigan) significantly affects the political process. If voters see a party's

candidates losing with a 15-to-30 percent vote, the voters who are inclined toward the policies of the losing candidate's party use that knowledge to keep the elected candidate's party in line. They threaten to bolt to the party of the losing candidate, knowing that the combination is potentially a winning one — in a fair election.

In other words, democracy is not a series of individual elections, each disconnected from the other. Rather, democracy is a process of successive elections, in which the votes of losing candidates are an integral and important part of the shaping of that electoral process. Suppressing the vote, through fraud, of a candidate who earns in fact between 15 and 30 percent of the vote has as significant an effect on the *electoral process* as defrauding a winning candidate.

If the Labor Party's actual vote is viewed in this way, one can rightly identify states in which drug decriminalization could not have been passed, in which nuclear energy plants would have been completed, and so forth but for the cumulative effects of frauds against the U.S. Labor Party since 1974.

Considering the states in which the Labor Party's actual influence, combined, on voters' preferences and policies is a significant force in fact, the same observation can be made with respect to the U.S. Congress.

got a big boost last week when it was indicated that the party may have lost a great many votes in the August primary because of invalidated ballots.

The party contends the law sets unreasonable requirements and presented voters in the last primary with confusing instructions. . . . A major argument put forward by the Labor Party is that anyone who checked off one of the minor parties in the "party qualification" section on the primary ballot was

disqualified from voting for either Democratic or Republican candidates. If they tried, the ballot was voided. . . .

Now we're pointing all this out not in support of the Labor Party's challenge over the constitutionality of the law. We see it as reinforcement for our argument that the law simply goes too far in limiting minor party access to the ballot. . . . The Legislature should go back to the drawing board.