

mittee to Re-Elect the President,” which ran dirty tricks, including printing phony Democratic Party literature, during the 1972 election made famous by Watergate.)

In New Hampshire, it was revealed that a suspicious Republican outfit, called “Hands Across New Jersey,” which is headed by John Sheridan, convicted at one time of cocaine possession with intent to sell, had financed anti-Bradley television ads. This group has not revealed its sources of funding. In Puerto Rico, a lawsuit by the NPP, the party which is affiliated with the Republican Party, succeeded in taking the primary election process away from a leading Democrat, Sen. Eudaldo Baez Galib, who does not endorse Gore, and put the control under the Democratic National Committee (DNC).

But rather than risk fights that involve voters, like the one in Tennessee or Bush’s debacle in New York, Gore’s Democratic National Committee mafia will *cancel entire primaries* or rig the rules so that Democrats don’t know how to elect delegates to the convention.

Three cases are being fought out: Puerto Rico, South Carolina, and Arizona.

Puerto Rico: On the week of Jan. 24, the *San Juan Star* reported that the control of the Democratic primary had been put under the “Rules and Bylaws Committee of the Democratic National Committee,” as the result of a dubious lawsuit filed by “pro-statehood” forces in the Commonwealth, against the duly elected head of the Democratic Party primary process, Sen. Eudaldo Baez Galib, a leader of the Partido Popular Democrático (PPD). The suit that put the DNC in control is extremely suspect in that it was filed by a member of the NPP, the affiliate of the Republican Party. NPP operative Sen. Kenneth McClintock claimed that Senator Baez Galib’s structure threatened to discriminate against “pro-statehood Democrats.”

Prominent political figures in Puerto Rico say that this is an attempt to unlawfully interfere with the primary, and create a chaotic situation where the primary would be opened up to non-Democrats. The prime beneficiary would be Al Gore, who supports “statehood,” which the elected head of the election process, Senator Baez Galib, does not. Supporters of Lyndon LaRouche also fear that this NPP and DNC interference could lead to the cancellation of an open primary, as had been done in 1996. While the primary is currently scheduled for March 26, and the Puerto Rican election authorities have notified the LaRouche campaign that LaRouche is on the ballot, there is a possibility that the DNC could still interfere with the primary when the DNC delegation arrives in February.

South Carolina: While the nation’s attention is rivetted on this state’s Republican primary on Feb. 19, the Democratic Party has *cancelled* its primary, which had been originally scheduled for March 9! The cancellation came after the DNC was caught red-handed, ordering the State Democratic Party to reject LaRouche’s candidacy. South Carolina Democrats still don’t know how—or if—they will be allowed to vote to nominate a Democratic candidate.

Arizona: In December, Arizona Democratic Party chairman Mark Fleisher personally rejected LaRouche as a candidate in the party-run primary and forced the Secretary of State to cancel the state-run primary, in which LaRouche would have qualified. But now, the party is being sued for an even bigger plan of discrimination: an “Internet Primary,” which would give the vote to affluent white voters, at the expense of minorities, many of whom don’t have access to the Internet.

The suit brought by the Voting Integrity Project, a Virginia-based organization which fights election fraud, charges that the Internet Primary is invalid, because it was not approved by the U.S. Department of Justice and may be a violation of the 1965 Voting Rights Act. There is good reason to believe that it does indeed violate the Act: According to Commerce Department reports, 32% of whites in 1998 had access to the Internet, compared with 10% of blacks, and 10% of Hispanics. As for Native Americans, one tribal chairman in northern Arizona said, “It’s only been two years ago when we actually got telephone lines available to our tribal members.”

“This promotes voter turnout in predominantly white neighborhoods at the expense of minority voters,” said Timothy Casey, a Phoenix attorney representing the group. “While the suburbanite in north Scottsdale can sip coffee and vote, the Navajo cannot.”

The Department of Justice is now reviewing the case, and has 60 days to decide. But the Voting Integrity Project wants a three-judge panel to examine the evidence itself, and delay the vote until the matter is settled.

International Endorsements

LaRouche is hailed as ‘the American Sakharov’

The following is a selection of international endorsements of Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.’s campaign for the Democratic Party Presidential nomination.

Europe

Slovakia—Dr. Jozef Miklosko.

I, Jozef Miklosko, former Vice-Premier of the first elected post-communist federal government of the former Czechoslovak Federal Republic, now vice rector of Trnava University in Trnava, Slovakia, strongly support my good friend Lyndon LaRouche for President of the United States of America, since his economic, political, humanistic, and spiritual program can help save America and the world.

There are these reasons for my support:

I know LaRouche and his ideas very well. I met him 15 times and I have discussed with him for more than 40 hours. He is a politician and an economist, but also a mathematician and a musical scientist. His concept of the physical economy, of production instead of speculation, is against any type of socialist economy, but also against the liberalistic capitalism dominated by free-trade ideology. His concept is coherent with the politics and economy of Christian moral principles. For years, he has warned against speculation in the financial markets which is leading the world economic system to collapse. He proposes the creation of a new Bretton Woods system, and at the same time has elaborated many projects of development for Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

He speaks openly and clearly of problems; his language is yes or no. LaRouche is the American Sakharov, a politician with global thoughts and original ideas. He is a generator of new ideas, a fighter for the maintenance of the Christian civilization. He loves his country, is an American patriot, who believes in God and speaks of every man as created in the image of God, and that life has a higher moral value. His forecasts for America and also for Eastern and Central Europe become reality. He gives to the U.S.A. and to the world an alternative of better development.

Lev Tolstoy wrote in *War and Peace*, that as evil unites itself to do evil, so the Good must unite itself to be able to fight against evil. From my personal experience, Lyndon LaRouche stays at the side of the good will of humanity. He is an honest politician with a lot of knowledge and courage, for this I suggest that the American citizens give him their vote in the Presidential election.

Ibero-America

Mexico—Juan Leyva Mendivil, former Congressman, president of the Farmers Alliance of the Northeast.

We observe with great hopes the efforts of your electoral campaign to achieve the Democratic Party nomination that would permit you to contend for the Presidency of the United States.

We find of special interest your proposals to return to the protectionist economic policies that made the development of the global economy possible after World War II.

As men involved in agricultural production, we share your concepts of economy, which stress the urgency of reestablishing a policy of guarantee or parity prices for basic grains; measures which, as you point out, will only be possible in the context of establishing a new world economic order, based on a commitment of sovereign nation-states to value the natural rights of peoples, and to defeat the financial forces which survive on looting and speculation, basing themselves on the doctrine of free trade.

We wish you the best of successes in your campaign, since humanity urgently needs the United States to once again light the beacon of liberty and progress.

British lies disgrace Library of Congress

by Anton Chaitkin

“The culture of the day, the thoughts and aims of men, are English. . . . Those who resist it do not feel it or obey it less.”

—Ralph Waldo Emerson, 1856

This is the theme of the shameful exhibit of pictures and interpretive texts, “John Bull and Uncle Sam: Four Centuries of British-American Relations,” now at the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C. The two opposite poles of modern history, imperial Britain and republican America, are here grossly misrepresented and shown strictly from the imperial British standpoint.

The central political conflict in our history is eliminated, and America’s unique purpose for existing—to uplift the common man—is blocked out. London surely relishes putting on this exhibit, especially in the Library of Congress, whose books were used as kindling when the invading British Army burned the Library and the other government buildings in the War of 1812.

Lies and more lies

The visitor begins the exhibit looking at this text: “Although some of the first British settlers in America left their native land because they believed it needed reform, by the 18th century most Americans saw England as a model to emulate.” The exhibit does not even hint at what evil needed reforming, and the settlers’ motives are presented as mercenary and imperialistic.

A poster-sized cartoon shows the Declaration of Independence put away in Uncle Sam’s back pocket, and a new “Declaration of Interdependence” is spread out across the Atlantic.

Scots and Irish emigrants to America are depicted with no suggestion that they had a problem with the England which drove them here.

The American Revolution supposedly involved a British overreaction to American terrorism. The Boston Tea Party was an American mob action “goading Britain into harsh retaliatory legislation.” The 1770 Boston Massacre involved a “mob fired upon by British troops who were being verbally and physically abused by the Americans.” A famous print of the Massacre is said to be “a masterpiece of anti-British propaganda, inflaming American sentiments.”

An American cartoon showing Britain arming Indians to