

from the United States, is the kind of response to a crash that should have been taken by Hoover in 1929, or something thereabouts, but was taken by Franklin Roosevelt, in March of 1933.

We have to move to put this bankrupt, mismanaged financial system under reorganization, under financial receivership. We must keep the banks functioning, other institutions essential to our nation, functioning. We must keep the doors open. But the banks must be taken into receivership, and similar financial companies taken into receivership, by the Federal government, in order to protect the people, and to protect the nation.

In the same way as Roosevelt did back in 1933 and thereafter, we must resort to the Federal ability to manage the economy, to manage the currency, to create a fund of capital investment, initially for large-scale infrastructure projects, to get enough people employed, enough businesses activated, to bring the level of activity and income of the households and the states up to the point that the states can manage their budgets, and meet their obligations.

At the same time, we must bring the nation as a whole, up above the breakeven point, where we're building our way out of the crisis. This means large-scale infrastructure; it means employment in power generation and distribution of power; it means employment in water projects, of which we need

many; it means employment in mass transportation. It means also aid to education, especially to rebuilding our shattered healthcare system—which again, the HMO bill has devastated. It means also providing credit to banks which may be bankrupt themselves, but must still function as institutions for managing credit in local regions. To make sure that funds are available, credit is available, to businesses of merit in local areas, to build up private employment in the environment created by expansion of employment, in the building up of basic economic infrastructure.

That is what has to be done. So far, because the leadership of both parties—that is, the campaign leadership—has completely ducked the issues, we're now plunging into a great depression. And neither Kerry, for example, nor, of course, George Bush, has the slightest idea, or intention, of doing what is needed to get us through this kind of mess. They don't understand the problem, as I do.

Therefore, don't believe what the Democratic Party says. They've acted as racists; they should cut it out and reform themselves. They should understand that they must go back to becoming what Roosevelt represented, the party which represented the interests of the forgotten man; which builds the country, and thinks about all of the people, not just some of the people.

That is the policy you must adopt. We must do it now.

## How Excluding LaRouche Lost Gore 2000 Election

Some 53,150 Democrats voted for Lyndon LaRouche in the May 2000 Arkansas Democratic Primary—18.23% of the vote cast, which entitled LaRouche to send at least seven delegates to the Democratic National Convention. The candidate was not surprised by the vote. But the Democratic National Committee, and Arkansas Democratic bureaucrats were hysterical at the prospect of LaRouche breaking open the vacuous Convention prepared for loser Al Gore. The Democratic Party therefore proceeded to disqualify LaRouche—disenfranchising his 53,000 Democratic voters—and to give his delegates to Gore! This flagrantly violated state election law, and the landmark 1965 Voting Rights Act, passed expressly to protect minority voters from the racist exclusion policies Southern Democrats practiced for decades.

The LaRouche delegates took the matter to state court, where the Democratic Party's lawyer successfully urged the court to "put on its hood and robe" and invoke the 1996 U.S. Supreme Court *LaRouche v. Fowler* decision,

nullifying the Voting Rights Act, and making the Democratic Party again a racist, private club.

With LaRouche excluded from the Democratic Convention, the way was cleared for the DNC-directed Gore campaign to lose to the dumbest man ever to occupy the Presidency, George W. Bush—by the margin of the Florida vote, the media and pundits screamed.

Ironically, the truth is much simpler: *Gore would not have needed Florida to win, if he had won Arkansas*. He lost Arkansas in November by fewer than the 53,000 votes he'd stolen from LaRouche. Had he not disenfranchised those Democrats, he probably would have won Arkansas, and thus the Presidency.

Come 2004, for the May 18 Arkansas Primary, State Democratic Chair Ron Oliver filed a list of candidates with Democratic Secretary of State Charlie Daniels; it now included an "Uncommitted" line, besides those for LaRouche, Kerry, and Kucinich. (The Democratic chair had not put "Uncommitted" on the ballot in 2000, although the Secretary of State's Counsel Tim Humphries told *EIR* that Statute 7-8-201 required it.) In the 2004 Primary, LaRouche's vote was 6%, while "Uncommitted" siphoned off 24% of the Democratic vote. Once again, the Democratic Party is choosing to lose to Bush, by excluding LaRouche.—*Anita Gallagher*