

'Sovereignty, above all,' says Peru's Ricketts

The following statement by Peruvian journalist and former Minister of State Patricio Ricketts Rey de Castro, on U.S. government interference in the Peruvian elections, was read at a press conference of Lyndon LaRouche's Presidential campaign, in Houston, Texas, on March 30. Entitled "Sovereignty, Above All," it was also read on Peruvian television on March 31:

It shouldn't surprise anyone that the White House sticks its nose in the Peruvian elections. Its impertinence has become universal. And it persists as a bad habit. Wherever it should not get involved, there you will find it. From one corner to the other. With as much arrogance as stupidity. Except, of course, where it should be concerned, which is in its own house. The United States, which has set itself up as the unappealable arbiter of what is and what is not democratic, is laughable. Because it sees the mote in someone else's eye, while it has a beam in its own.

And what a beam! White House occupant Mr. Clinton was elected by 43% of the vote, in an election in which half the electorate preferred to turn their back on the process. Thus, Clinton won as much electoral support as did [former UN Secretary General] Dr. [Javier] Pérez de Cuéllar [who ran for President against Fujimori in 1996] in Peru. And they tell us that his victory was not only legitimate, but overwhelming!

'Extreme hypocrisy'

But let us look, if you will, at the current electoral process in the United States. And at the high levels of democracy to which the White House would like to elevate us. What does the campaign committee of Democratic Party Presidential candidate and economist Lyndon LaRouche, who has been called the American Sakharov for his persistent dissidence, think? It says that the electoral process in the United States has become "a mockery of all internationally recognized standards for free and fair elections in a democracy." And what, in LaRouche's judgment, do the repeated observations of the State Department about supposed electoral deficiencies in other countries prove? Only this—and I quote him: "the extreme hypocrisy of these pronouncements."

Shameless manipulation

Not content with personally denouncing electoral manipulation in the United States, LaRouche has, over the past few

days, invited several independent and knowledgeable national and international observers to take note of what is going on. A former President of Uganda, and various American, European, and Asian personalities, went to Detroit.

What did they find there? That the Democratic Party refused to recognize LaRouche's pre-candidacy, despite his having won the January primary in the state, and presented thousands of signatures of support. What did the authorities of Clinton's party adduce? That by virtue of being an independent organization, that party could do whatever it felt like. And what else was witnessed? That at one site, people voted with hands raised, publicly, while at another, the voters formed two lines: one for Al Gore and one for his main rival. Of course, there was no line for LaRouche. He wasn't even permitted. Nor was there any secrecy to the election. And what percentage of the citizenry participated in that electoral act, which we Peruvians should take as a democratic model? One percent! And what does the democratic U.S. press say about this, that we should also imitate? Absolutely nothing! Of course, what was observed in Detroit is not the exception, but the rule.

Non-governmental organizations

As has already been indicated, this electoral manipulation has produced—according to LaRouche's campaign committee—one of the greatest abstention rates in the world. And, we would add, anomalies such as Ross Perot, the candidate who obtained 28% of the popular vote and not a single electoral vote. Not one!

Nevertheless, the White House is worried about the mote in our eye, and not the beam in its own. And the State Department pompously announces that it supports the critics of the Peruvian elections. Why shouldn't they support them, since many of those critics are their own, generously financed boys? Plus, there are the non-governmental organizations, which should perhaps call themselves the para-governmental organizations, remote-controlled by lobby groups at the service of their mentors' often hidden interests.

Fundamental conclusion

And so we are observed, up close, by the White House. It's not a matter of losing sleep over it, but rather to reach a conclusion. The great theme of this election and of those across the continent is not employment, nor the economy, nor education. It is sovereignty, without which we would not be a country. We wouldn't be anything. And we would not be in any condition to seek any solutions to any problems.

And so, we are grateful to the White House which, unwittingly, reminds us that, under so-called globalization, sovereignty has not only *not* gone out of style, but is more necessary than ever. Without it, we would be serfs, not citizens with rights. We hope that nobody forgets this on April 9.