

Voter Suppression Is A Crime, Says LaRouche

The following statement concerning vote fraud in the recent Presidential election, is excerpted from the discussion following Lyndon LaRouche's Nov. 9 speech to an international webcast. See page 4 for the opening speech.

Moderator, Debra Freeman: Many questions are coming in directly from Ohio—some from the press in Ohio, some from activists in Ohio—all concerning the question of the viability of the vote. Carl Gordon, who is the editor of *The Reporter* in Akron, Ohio, says, “after listening to hundreds of voters, I just don’t believe the closeness of the results. After looking at the actual numbers, they seem to have been predetermined. I expected some counties to be 80%-20%, but across the board, all the results are the same. They’re all 49% to 51%.”

Henry Raines from American AM radio says, Mr. LaRouche, will your organization take a leadership role in challenging the alleged fraud in the Nov. 2 election? Will you join the call for full multi-state investigations into the irregularities and exit poll discrepancies? Many so-called public interest groups seem content to just roll over. Jerry Nadler, John Conyers, and some of the other ranking Democrats, and also Rep. Wexler from Florida, have submitted a letter to the Judiciary Committee saying that review of the vote is necessary. Finally, Michael Cox from Votescam asks simply, did the Republicans steal the vote? Lyn, everybody wants to know what you have to say about this, and want some direction as to how to proceed?

LaRouche: Well, there’s no question that there was a combination of operations, which were implicitly totally unconstitutional—that is, the intent of the Constitution—which did determine a favorable tilt in the vote for Bush, and which was nourished by the fact that the Democratic Party has for a number of years behaved like a bunch of bums on the technicalities of conducting national and state elections. They paid no attention, like this thing in Florida in 2000. The reason that the Bush crowd was able to get “finality” as James Baker III demanded it then, was because the Democrats had done a sloppy job in preparing for the contingencies of the 2000 vote, and therefore left openings which the Republican machine had carefully crafted itself to go through, to manipulate that vote.

The Democratic Party has behaved like a bunch of slobs,

and part of this is the fact that the Democratic Party has turned away from being a mass-based constituency party, into being an upper-20% party, based on the British Liberal Imperialist doctrine of Blair, of the so-called “middle.” Of going for the suburban vote, and therefore counting that the usual—the Democrats were actually preaching, going for, they set themselves up for the Republicans. They were actually going for a fall, by advertising a commitment to their usual voters, of the three out of the past four federal elections, from suburbia primarily. And they were looking for a 50% plus one vote, as a policy of the Democratic Party from early in the year, and even earlier, going into the entire election.

Get Out the Vote to Beat the Fraud

And it was only in the late stage that somebody got the idea, and I said, you’re up against a major fraud, and the only way to overwhelm it is by creating a landslide turnout, from among youth and from among the lower 80% of family income brackets. It’s the only chance we have, and by getting the turnout, it doesn’t merely mean telling them to turn out, it means organizing them! You don’t get the voters to the polls by telling them to go. You get the voters to the polls by organizing them! Every Democrat knows that! So you have an organizing machine to get them to the polls on Election Day! That’s how you get the vote.

But you have to have the organization to do it, you have to have the willingness and the program to do it, and the Democratic party had gone with this crazy “middle” thing, which is imported from the British, and from this fascist Samuel P. Huntington, with his famous paper—this sidekick of Brzezinski—the Crisis in Democracy, which became “Project Democracy.” We have a dictatorship in the United States called “Project Democracy,” which is run by the leaders of the Republican and Democratic Party. They sit there in Washington, adjacent to the Congress, and they run the party system. And the party people let it run that way.

I’ve run into a lot of trouble with that. But we’ve been going for the upper 20% of the vote as the core vote, and trying to run elections on that basis, and policies addressed to that. That’s our mistake. Now, what this did is two things. First of all, we did succeed, particularly once Kerry agreed with Clinton to change the mode of the election. We did get a better election process, but we had a poor base to start with. We did not have an organized electoral program base, consistent with what Kerry and Clinton agreed upon in terms of reforming the campaign. And it was much too late, though we tried to do the best we could.

What we did succeed in doing, with the youth and with other constituencies, not only my associates but others we were working and cooperating with, was an excellent job in turning out an increase in the vote. We did not have the machine we needed, to ensure that the vote was delivered to the polls, but we did stimulate a lot of vote, in the right direction.

But meanwhile, the Republican machine, sitting there, knowing that the Democratic Party is called the sitting duck party. It is totally unprepared to deal with the kinds of things which transparently the Republican Party machine was planning. Now, from a constitutional law standpoint, what was made was a not-so-cold coup d’état against the United States Constitution.

One fact alone is outstanding. Voter suppression action, as cited by the NAACP, and as the Republicans went after the NAACP on that issue, typifies the issue. The very fact of voter suppression action is a violation of the Voting Rights Act. Therefore, my view is, let’s start from the criminality of the criminal, and find out secondary crimes he committed. The criminality of the Republican Party—they had this guy, this so-called African-American, standing out with his big fat face hanging out, saying he’s in charge of the vote suppression program! I mean, this is an admission of a crime! It’s a violation of federal law, and I would go after that because a coup was run against the American people and the Constitution, by violation of that law.

Start from there. Okay, you guys are crooks. Now, what other little crimes did you commit? You want to confess, you want to cut a deal, a plea-bargain? The point is, the moral authority that we have is what we have to begin with. We have great moral authority in saying this election was a fraud. The moral authority for saying that statement, there’s sufficient evidence for that statement, is the evidence of the voter suppression campaign, as we know it from Louisiana, as we know it from Florida, as we know it from elsewhere. As we know it also in the state of Ohio.

Voter suppression is subversion, and a party that engages in voter suppression, the officials of that party who engage in that and those who knowingly cooperate in that program, are guilty of a crime, of violation of the Voters Rights Act, and they should be imprisoned for the relevant period of time, and they should be squeezed for all its worth. What we have to do is take the high position, the high position of moral authority. Not kiss the butt of Bush, which many Democrats are prepared to do. I don’t know what their tastes are, but that’s what they propose to do. And what we have to do is take the moral high ground of authority, and say, well, you guys committed a crime. You allowed a crime to go on, called vote suppression. You were trying every pretext in the world to suppress the votes of people, known groups of people, and you were targeting on a racist and similar basis. It’s a crime. And I would say to these, let’s start from the strong point that we have. We have a lot of evidence of irregularities, a lot of evidence of corruption. Things that could not have happened by accident. And therefore, let’s start with what we’ve got the goods on these guys for. They engaged in a systemic voter suppression action. *That* had an effect on the vote. Therefore, you guys are guilty of a crime! Say, good morning, judge.