Sir Keith Joseph implicated in vote fraud

Sir Keith Joseph

The executive intelligence board of the private, international political-intelligence news service, New Solidarity International Press Service (NSIPS) today released its preliminary report of undercover and other investigations into the combined election-rigging and vote-fraud against Democratic Presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. in the Feb. 26 New Hampshire primary.

The NSIPS executive report, released March 2, 1980, is as follows.

Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. received not less than 20 percent, and perhaps as much as 25 percent of the vote cast in the February 26 New Hampshire Democratic primary. Of this total, a 16-plus percent vote for LaRouche is proven by recanvass of a 35,000-name, name-by-name listing, by street address and polling district. "Exit polling" and eyewitness affidavits reporting the numbers of votes stolen from LaRouche and given to Kennedy and Carter tallies by election moderators in local polling-places provides the basis for estimating the total LaRouche vote to have been between 20 percent and 25 percent.

The stealing of actual LaRoouche votes cast was done by individual, local election-moderators, many among whom already face criminal charges in complaints currently either filed or to be filed early this week. This part of the action corroborates pre-election reports received from reliable sources, reports which stated that election moderators had been purchased in wholesale lots through Boston backers of the Kennedy candidacy.

However, although Kennedy received the greatest portion of the votes stolen from the LaRouche totals, documentary evidence in hand proves that the preconditions for the vote-stealing were negotiated in a "great compromise" effected by the Kennedy and Carter machines prior to election-day. According to the version of this "compromise" published by the Kennedy campaign and secured by LaRouche undercover investigators, the agreement to enable fraud was negotiated in complicity with state Democratic Party chairman Romeo Dorval, with complicity of Governor Hugh Gallen and Senator Durkin. Not only were LaRouche poll-watchers unlawfully excluded from the polls, but eyewitness sworn testimony shows that Kennedy and Carter representatives in numerous instances supervised the actions of local moderators, itself another unlawful action.

The important question posed by this mass of evidence is "Why did those involved in coordinating this vote-theft go to such extremes? Why did they, for example, not limit the vote-stealing to the amount needed to reduce the reported LaRouche vote to a more believable 7-8 percent of the vote, rather than leaving evidence of fraud 'hanging from the trees' with vote-theft on the scale of 16-20 percent of the entire vote cast in that election? Why did they go so far as to virtually ensure that substantial numbers of the local election-officials bought would face immediate criminal charges? Why place the state's Governor, the Chairman and Secretary of the state Democratic Party, a U.S. Senator, and many others in imminent jeopardy by going to such extremes?"

To trace the trail of evidence from the local election-moderators now facing criminal charges to the source of the decision to conduct such massive fraud, we must follow the pathway leading from the vote-fraud itself, through the massive apparatus of rigging of the environment of the election by officials of the CBS network and others.

The trail ends in the circles of the Trilateral Commission and New York Council on Foreign Relations soon

to meet in London to select the respective Democratic and Republican candidates to be nominated this summer in Detroit and New York City. Near the top of the heap among those Britons scheduled to "advise" the Trilateral Commission on whom they should choose to become next President of the United States is Sir Keith Joseph, already for several years the most visible among the high-level British-intelligence coordinators of international actions against candidate LaRouche.

'Fascism with a democratic face'

At the 1975 Tokyo conference of the Trilateral Commission—which selected Jimmy Carter to be made the next U.S. President—Trilateraloid Samuel P. Huntington acted as the most prominent spokesman for a proposal to end democratic forms of government. This proposal was more recently implemented as the Carter administration's Presidential Review Memorandum #32 (PRM-32), and put into operation one day before the "Three Mile Island incident" in March 1979. The new agency instituted on that date is known as the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). FEMA, which orchestrated the "Three Mile Island" event more or less as Josef Goebbels and Hermann Goering orchestrated the 1934 "Reichstag fire," is a virtual duplication of the "emergency" provisions inserted into the constitution of the Weimar Republic of Germany to enable Adolf Hitler's "legal coup d'etat."

Although both the Republican National Committee and the Carter Administration currently support the Nazi-modelled doctrines of Milton Friedman, it is not the present intent of the "think tanks" controlling the RNC's policies to institute uniformed hooligans wearing swastika brassards. The crude outer appearances of the Nazi and Mussolini regimes are not on the table. A more politically sophisticated approach is projected. This approach is most frequently identified by its backers as "fascism with a democratic face." The outer shell of constitutional institutions is to be maintained—albeit a hollowed-out outer shell. The Federal executive, the congress and the Federal judiciary are to become mere stage-figures, with the fascist producers, directors and script-writers behind the scenes writing the lines, and manipulating political life of the electorate by techniques known as "crisis management."

The boosters of that "fascism with a democratic face" policy for the existing democracies are divided into several factions. One faction, the more 'liberal" element, leans toward the sort of fascism proposed by Bertrand Russell and Aldous Huxley. This group desires to create a mass social base for fascism out of today's "environmentalists," "SA stormtroopers in rock-drug counterculture mufti." The other faction leans toward the doctrines of H.G. Wells, the fascist military-economy squatting on top of a ruined civilian economy—outside the preatorian ranks of the industrial-financier interests concentrated in a new sort of military-industrial establishment, Goering-style.

The most evil of all the significant forces behind the Goering-style or H.G. Wells policy is the Mont Pelerin Society. Milton Friedman, von Hayek, and the Heritage Foundation are the best-known representatives of that fascist faction in the United States. Sir Keith Joseph, the controller of London's "Jane Byrne," Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, is the chief of the most visible spokesmen for this fascist faction in Great Britain today.

There is no speculation in this. Each of the foregoing statements is supported by documentation available in the public domain.

Joseph as the author of anti-LaRouche operations

Proof that Sir Keith Joseph was coordinating much of the harassment against LaRouche was conclusively established during the period beginning May 1978. Direct proof of Keith's role in this operation was provided through cross-checking statements which Frances M. Watson (of the Heritage Foundation) and Michael Deaver (formerly of Reagan's "Citizens for the Republic") volunteered to undercover investigators during 1978 and 1979. Both volunteered the information that their respective "dirty tricks" operations against LaRouche were being conducted as implementation of a policy decision of the Mont Pelerin Society. In the course of continuing undercover penetration of Heritage Foundation circles, Deaver and Watson volunteered the additional information that a Hong Kong conference of the Mont Pelerin Society had assigned Winston Churchill III and Robert Moss to coordinate the international slander and libel operations against LaRouche. This information was corroborated by cross-checking, and Sir Keith Joseph, of the London branch of the Mont Pelerin Society, was proven by cross-grids to be the immediate executive responsible for all principal operations against LaRouche.

There is not the slightest exaggeration in describing Milton Friedman as consciously a Nazi economist. Not only is Friedman's doctrine a dirty copy of that of Nazi Finance Minister Hjalmar Schacht, the man who put Hitler into power, but Friedman has publicly acknowledged and defended this connection. Friedman, von Hayek, Josephs and the Heritage Foundation are Nazi institutions by the same set of criteria.

If the Nazi-modelled doctrine of the Mont Pelerin Society and Heritage Foundation is compared with the contents of the 1975-1976 "Project 1980s" policy papers written for the Carter Administration under the direction of Cyrus Vance, Zbigniew Brzezinski and others, no

honest, intelligent citizen can doubt for another moment that the objectives of the Trilateral Commission for the United States and most of the world are the immediate implementation of massive global genocide on behalf of establishing a world order modelled economically on the Nazi doctrines of Hitler's backer, Hjalmar Schacht.

Why so much fear of LaRouche?

According to U.S. government documents secured under the Freedom of Information Act, direct operations against LaRouche by Henry A. Kissinger date from no later than 1975. The direct activities of Kissinger against LaRouche were prompted, most immediately and narrowly, by LaRouche's significant international influence around two projects launched during April 1975. The first was LaRouche's publication of a proposal for establishing a new, gold-based monetary system, entitled the "International Development Bank." The second was LaRouche's proposal to employ the means of monetary reform to provide the missing ingredient in pre-existing efforts to secure comprehensive Arab-Israeli peace.

As stated by key political and financial representatives of British secret foreign intelligence to LaRouche's associates during 1976-77, LaRouche was ranked as a "potential danger" to London's policies; this characterization was modified to "fearful potential danger" during 1979—especially after the success of President Giscard and Chancellor Schmidt to implement "phase 1" of a new gold-based monetary system, the establishment of the European Monetary System.

Currently, key governments of continental Western Europe and of nations including Mexico are under massive pressure not to make any gestures which could be interpreted as lending credibility to LaRouche's efforts. Much of this pressure on governments and other, private influential circles is conduited through the U.S. State Department, but the heaviest direct pressures are conduited by Trilateral Commission representative Henry A. Kissinger.

Purposes of the New Hampshire vote fraud

Massive libellous coverage of LaRouche in major news media around the nation contrasts with a virtual blackout of all straight coverage. Libels running to thousands of words appear in the Washington, D.C. area press, *The New York Times*, and other journals, while less than three cumulative minutes of network news coverage, most of it tainted with gratuitous libels, was devoted to LaRouche prior to the Feb. 26 election.

This was noted, most emphatically, by foreign correspondents assigned to the last weeks of the New Hampshire primary. Those correspondents noted that LaRouche was running the largest and best media advertising campaign in New Hampshire, had the largest staff of professional volunteers and had support running to over 20 percent of the Democratic voters during the pre-election period. Moreover, the entire press corps in New Hampshire for the last weeks of the campaign discussed almost nothing but the topic of LaRouche and LaRouche's campaign over their evening libations in hotel cocktail lounges. They also picked up press gossip of impending, massive fraud against LaRouche before the election was held. Moreover, the computer print-out of the News Election Service shows, in time sequence, the approximate hours of the day in which the vote fraud against LaRouche was set into final phases of operation.

The reasons for such a massive fraud with such a monstrous back-fire potential are summarily as follows:

(1) International

The reason for running LaRouche's reported vote down to less than 3 percent, as preagreed by Washington's high-level intelligence circles, was to prevent Western Europe from using support for LaRouche's candidacy as a signal that the United States was not uniformly hostile to the creation of a gold-based monetary system. In other words, this aspect of the vote-fraud was directed toward continued containment of extremely restive Western European and other foreign governments.

(2) Press control

Even a 7-8 percent level of press-reported vote for LaRouche would ensure significant "straight" press coverage of LaRouche, thus breaking the "containment" around the LaRouche campaign. This policy was publicly stated by representatives of the Anti-Defamation League, a nominally Jewish, organized-crime entity which Canon West of the New York Anglican cathedral has identified as deployed against LaRouche under contract from the pro-Nazi Joseph et al. in London.

(3) Stop LaRouche's momentum

Without massive harassment against individual voters in New Hampshire, LaRouche would have won not merely the 20-25 percent of the vote cast for his candidacy, but would have certainly won the New Hampshire primary over Carter as well as Kennedy. LaRouche proved himself potentially the best vote-getter among all of the candidates currently running, barring, for the moment, Governor Ronald Reagan. In fact, it was LaRouche's campaign against the Trilateral Commission which indirectly provided Reagan the margin of election victory in New Hampshire. Therefore, there was an all-out commitment to attempt to stop LaRouche absolutely in New Hampshire, even to the point of risking sending local figures as high-ranking as Governor Hugh Gallen to prison in order to conduct vote fraud on such a massive scale.

Italian newspaper reports CFR link

The Italian daily Vita Sera *reported on charges of electoral fraud in New Hampshire leveled by Republican candidate John Anderson and Democrat Lyndon LaRouche. The following are excerpts from that article published on March 5.*

... Both Anderson and LaRouche have now forced a recount [in New Hampshire] so that they could this time control the results. The recount will take place today. The Democratic candidate maintains that he received between 15 to 20 percent of the vote, and that therefore about 20,000 of his ballots disappeared. Furthermore, he has revealed that this is not the first time that there have been murky goings-on surrounding the counting of ballots.

In Rome, as in other capitals of Europe, LaRouche can count on a group of supporters, the "Citizens for LaRouche", who conduct a species of long distance electoral campaign in his behalf. Certain private television stations have transmitted an electoral "brief", if for nothing else, in order to make the candidate known. Now a direct line connects Europe to New Hampshire.

They say that irrefutable proof is being gathered about the New Hampshire imbroglio. A news release made available in Rome speaks of the openly fraudulent results of the primary, and reports on the "hot" declarations of LaRouche. "Those responsible for this crime," the candidate says, "will be brought to trial. The falsification of electoral results, even of only one vote, is a class B offense. The fraud in New Hampshire involves 20,000 votes."...

LaRouche attributes the presumed electoral fraud to his outspoken opposition to the foreign and economic policy of Carter and of the Council on Foreign Relations, which he defines as a kind of shadow government of the United States which counts among its members National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski and many other important American personalities. The arguments used in support of this thesis are in part the same contained in the dossier that the European Labor Party released in the period of the Moro case. [Referring to the kidnapping and subsequent assassination of former Italian Prime Minister Aldo Moro in May, 1978)]. In brief, certain power circles in the U.S. would like to impede the creation of a new world economic system and hence strike out at Lyndon LaRouche, "who is considered in Europe to be the originator of the European Monetary System." In reality, according to the friends of LaRouche, Carter together with the Council on Foreign Relations is attempting to turn the U.S. into a "fascist country."

LaRouche has explained that the attempt to damage his person is part of an overall attempt to "destroy" the European Monetary System.

Spanish press cites fraud

On the day following the New Hampshire primary, the Madrid daily El Pueblo *charged "fraud." The article, written by the paper's New York correspondent, Julio Camarero, reports on the charges of a campaign spokesman for Lyndon LaRouche.*

"Massive vote fraud in the New Hampshire primaries." This is the grave accusation which has been launched by Dennis Small—who assures us of having documentary evidence to prove it—an official spokesman for Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche, a political figure who, up to now, has been condemned to silence. Perhaps because since the launching of his campaign he has done nothing but state facts as hard-hitting as a fist.

Small attempts to expose a maneuver allegedly carried out by Carter's security advisor, Zbigniew Brzezinski, through the efficient machine of the Council on Foreign Relations and of the Trilateral Commission, designed to leave LaRouche in the shadows and ensure that his name will not appear on the three major T.V. networks—CBS, ABC and NBC—during the special programs on yesterday's primaries, leaving LaRouche relegated to that anonymous category where "other candidates" are thrown indiscriminately.

Lyndon LaRouche supports the new European Monetary System to stop the inflationary spiral and reinvigorate world trade. He proposes ... incentives for scientific and technological research and for small industry. He seeks an administrative reform to reverse the irrational growth of the federal bureaucracy. He wants a no-holds-barred struggle to extirpate drug traffic from its roots and from the top. He also dared to declare that if he were elected President, he would dissolve the National Security Council. As if it wasn't risky enough to say all of the above just like that to the whole country right in front of the TV cameras, his suggestion that the National Security Council be dissolved would be sufficient, of itself, for Brzezinski to order him hunted down in the New Hampshire primaries. And to make sure, by whatever means necessary, that he did not get back on television.