

All the panelists addressed the General Welfare principle raised by LaRouche, as it is expressed in the catastrophic state of U.S. health care delivery. Dr. Muhammad confronted the citizens with the implications of the global AIDS epidemic:

“Abraham Lincoln put forth a principle in a political context, that it was impossible for there to be a nation that was half-free and half-slave. What I think, is that the epidemic of AIDS, which is global in its nature, emphasize that underlying principle in another way.

“That it is impossible for there to be a world of humanity, where part of that world is prosperous, relatively well-off, and the beneficiaries of a health-care system, and then, another huge portion of that humanity, that is deprived of that same thing. What AIDS forces humanity to do, is to either accept, acquiesce, to extinction, or to come together on the basis of the best principles of Christianity, Islam, Judaism, and the other great faiths, and say, in the spirit of compassion, ‘Yes! I am my brother’s keeper.’ ”

### **A somber warning**

The next day, LaRouche began the discussion with his California delegates with a somber warning: “The fact is, that if the Democratic Party is continuing its present direction, that it’s been continuing for the past weeks, then it’s assured that the Democratic Party will not only lose the Presidential campaign, but will also lose the Congressional campaigns by a significant margin in the coming year, in the coming elections.

“If the Democratic Party continues to play the game of the so-called ‘Third Way,’ trying to capture the 20 to 30% or so that are expected to vote, then they will not attract the support from the 80% of the population which lives in the lower half of the total income of the nation, and whose conditions of life are becoming worse.”

LaRouche said that if we do not bring a Democrat in as the next President, and if we do not take back the majority of the Congress for the Democratic Party, “There is no foreseeable future for the United States and its people.”

He challenged his delegates, and all Americans, to join him in organizing that 80% which is ignored by Gore and the Democratic National Committee’s treasonous leadership, to elect a President in the tradition of FDR. “Only with a President in the spirit and tradition of Roosevelt, only with a Congress which will support him, however reluctantly and only with such a President pulling together other nations to cooperate with the United States in reforming the international financial system and monetary system—only under those conditions, can we be assured that the nation is going to come out of the early years of this century in good shape, or even as a nation. You see all the signs, accelerating, of disintegration around us. We’ve got to reverse the trend, not follow it.”

His message was sobering, but also embodied the optimism and leadership LaRouche has so generously shared with all his audiences. He told this group that, in order to lead when the crisis hits here—and, he asserted, it will hit very soon—

they had to use every opportunity that the Presidential campaign afforded, to bring together those who represent the majority of the population. “If we can begin to get a significant number of people to turn out to vote, who otherwise would not vote, who represent these constituencies, we have very easily the power to overwhelm those of a contrary disposition, in both the Republican and Democratic Party. We have the power, potentially, to change things.”

It is precisely these interventions, which are growing in number and intensity, and which are on the verge of upsetting the plan for a totally controlled Presidential election, that has LaRouche’s enemies howling. But, their efforts to halt LaRouche’s candidacy and regain control over the election are also forcing these enemies into the open.

In an effort to block the threat which LaRouche’s candidacy poses to Gore capturing the Democratic nomination, Gore’s friends in the Democratic National Committee have gone so far as to call, in open court, for nullification of the Voting Rights Act. And, DNC chairman Joe Andrew, following the shockingly racist precedent set by his predecessor, Don Fowler, has issued a letter in which he seeks to cut off LaRouche’s campaign by denying duly elected LaRouche delegates access to the Democratic National Convention set for August.

On Jan. 22, LaRouche responded to Andrew in a letter, in which he warned the party of the dire consequences of continuing to seek to block his candidacy. LaRouche has authorized the public release of the letter, printed here. As *EIR* goes to press, Andrew has yet to respond.

## **Open up convention to secure Democratic victory, says LaRouche**

*The following letter by issued by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. to Joseph Andrew, National Chair, Democratic National Committee.*

January 22, 2000

Joseph J. Andrew  
National Chair  
Democratic National Committee  
430 South Capitol Street  
Washington, D.C. 20003

Subject: Your Letter to Harpootlian

Sir:

My representative has been issued a copy of your letter, datelined January 11, 2000, addressed to Dick Harpootlian,

the latter as State Chair of the South Carolina Democratic Party.

I have the pleasure to inform you that that letter, unless provably a forgery, would define you and your accomplices within the Democratic National Committee as, variously, consummate liars, Jaybird-style racists, and generally dishonorable persons.

Notably, the included statement, "Mr. LaRouche's expressed political beliefs, including beliefs which are explicitly racist and anti-Semitic . . .," is, in its entirety, a willful lie by you. It is either a witting lie, or is a statement uttered in reckless disregard for truth readily available to you. There is nothing of a mitigating quality to your advantage, in the remainder of your letter considered as a whole.

The following passage from your letter is crucial:

"In their own publications, in the media, and in paid advertisements, the LaRouche forces have attacked the DNC for supposedly having argued, in the course of this litigation, that the Voting Rights Act is unconstitutional. *Nothing could be further from the truth*" (your emphasis).

That denial by you is an outright lie.

What I have said and claimed, is set forth in a statement composed and issued by me, as this appeared on my campaign's website, and also published as a report in the December 17, 1999 edition of the newsweekly *Executive Intelligence Review*. As my statement clearly and rightly characterized the matter there, the characterization of the actions of DNC attorney Keeney, and of the argument foisted upon, and adopted by Judge Sentelle, are matters of the relevant Federal District Court, plainly set forth on the official record for August 16 and November 23, 1999. Taking also into account, the record of hearings on enactment of the 1965 Voting Rights Act, and also the issues of Morse which were heavily emphasized by Keeney in the August 16 proceeding, my characterization of Keeney's actions is accurate beyond the possibility of reasonable objection by members of the DNC.

There is, similarly, the widely circulated and much-endorsed letter from the Honorable Theo Mitchell, which reflects a reaction typical of Civil Rights veterans whose familiarity with the Voting Rights Act plainly surpasses that of the DNC's legal counsel. Thus, the actions of DNC attorney Keeney are to be considered baldly racist in character.

I emphasize that the Fowler efforts to coerce state party organizations into violations of the enforcement provisions of the Voting Rights Act, is the use of the party-as-a-private-club notion identical to those Texas Jaybird's Jim-Crow tactics, which were outlawed by the Voting Rights Act.

I also note that your letter states, that ". . . I will again, in the next few days, issue to all state party chairs a determination about Mr. LaRouche's failure to qualify. . . ." Such an emission would be an act worthy of a Texas Jaybird of pre-Voting Rights Act vintage. If the DNC were to exploit the "private club" ruse as a cover for attempts to coerce state parties into violation of the enforcement provisions of the act,

would that not make the conduct of the DNC tantamount to a RICO or kindred conspiracy? Or, would such use of coercion by the DNC, in 1996 and again now, be proof of the absurdity of the "private club" argument? Does it not bring us back to the real world, wherein what one does, is what one is?

In the final analysis, if truth had no tongue, it might yet speak by some wonderful organ. Not only this Party, but also this nation as a whole, might pay a greater price than it could ever afford, for what amounts to a thuggish sort of effort to eliminate democracy (i.e., an open primary process and August convention), all for the purpose, in 1996 and again today, of forcing the year 2000 nomination of an intrinsically unelectable Presidential candidate down the throats of a pre-rigged coming convention?

The only chance for defeating the stone-age, Bush-supporting faction of the Republican Party, in the Congressional and Presidential elections of November 2000, is to proceed to prepare for a truly open convention of the Democratic Party in this coming August, rather than attempting to impose a Gore nomination by rigging the primary process in the way seen during the several recent months. For reason of a moral fault within his engrained nature, Gore can not draw support from the potential voting base of those in the lower eighty percentile of family-income brackets. Without large support from those whom Gore's Third-Way campaign ideology regards as our republic's forgettable men and women, the Democratic Party has no chance in the November elections. Bush-backers' money and growing political base among the portion of the electorate in the upper twenty percent of income-brackets, would therefore ensure an easy victory for the Bush league. Texas Governor Bush may be the dumbest that notable Wall Street cash could buy, but even a blunt instrument like Bush could be, and is being employed as a suitable weapon of wickedly clever men.

The party bureaucracy rallied in support of the DNC's lies against me, could, admittedly, ram through a Gore nomination, but Gore is not only unelectable. His candidacy intrinsically alienates that vast sea of forgotten men and women of today's America, upon whom Gore turned his back so shamelessly in the matter of the 1996 welfare reform and other savage proposals to gut the general welfare of all in the lower eighty percentile of family-income brackets. The hateful taint of a Gore candidacy would thus drag the Democratic Congressional candidacies down to defeat with him.

In that case, let us all weep for our poor nation. At least, my conscience will be clean.

Since what you say against me personally is either the fruit of lies or kindred misrepresentation, the fact that you have produced no truthful claims against my candidacy, suggests that you have no honest objections, but, like any gangster's hit-man, are simply doing the lackey's job your master has assigned to you.

Sincerely,  
Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.