

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.