Lying and racism inside the Democratic National Committee: the implications

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

This statement was released by LaRouche's Committee for a New Bretton Woods. The full title is "Lying and racism by a cabal inside the Democratic National Committee: What are the true facts? What are the implications?"

December 9, 1999

On August 6, 1999, attorney John Keeney, Jr., the son of the U.S. Department of Justice's most notorious Deputy Attorney-General, Criminal Division czar John "Jack" Keeney, demanded that the Voting Rights Act of 1965 be annulled. This proposal was made on behalf of a cabal, of former Democratic National Chairman Don Fowler et al., operating under the cover of their positions within the bureaucracy of the Democratic Party's National Committee (DNC).

When my campaign's website informed DNC and other circles of Keeney's racist action, on November 3, 1999, the news of this action shocked many DNC members who had not been consulted, or even informed of this plainly racist pleading by Keeney. However, despite that widespread disgust with Fowler, Keeney, et al., the DNC itself has not yet taken any action, to date, to publicly repudiate Keeney's racism.

Rather than acting to nullify the position taken by Keeney et al., the DNC's top bureaucracy has sought to defend its racist actions by a bodyguard of lies. With its bare face hanging out, as the man said, the authors of Keeney's racist argument are lying, orally and in written communications, despite the fact that the Federal District Court Record for the District of Columbia [C.A. No. 96-1816; August 16, 1999] shows them to be lying in their attempted cover-up of their actions. Until recently, those lies circulated from the DNC were limited to oral communications. On November 23, 1999, my campaign issued a release identifying the lies which were then circulating orally from Washington, D.C. offices of the DNC.

Subsequently, following the appearance of a paid advertisement exposing Keeney's racist pleading, in the November 30, 1999 edition of the Philadelphia ***Tribune,*** a limited, private circulation of the DNC bureaucracy's lies among inquiring party officials, was allowed by the party's leadership, but broader publication of such statements was not otherwise authorized. Nonetheless, on December 5, an odious figure of the local Loudoun County, Virginia Democratic Committee, out-going Chairman Whitmer, released that lying statement from the DNC, through his private website. Whitmer, true to his known character, or lack thereof, added some lunatic filth of his own to what he represented as the DNC's lies.

So, as the saying goes, "the cat is now among the pigeons." Unless the DNC's racist and lying actions are soon disavowed and corrected, the Democratic Party could, even probably, suffer a virtual general rout nationwide, in the coming November 2000 general elections.

The fact that the DNC's relevant actions have been indisputably both racist and lying, is easily proven. My Democratic Presidential campaign has already documented evidence which proves both points beyond doubt, simply as a matter of official court transcripts of the case. What many will find it more difficult to understand, is the danger to the nation itself, if the DNC is allowed to continue to mislead the national Party into the November 2000 rout which the party bureaucracy's minestrone of racism and lying portends.

Now, turn to a summary of the bare facts of the case. Then, after that, focus upon the danger these actions portend for the future of our nation.

1. The bare facts of the Keeney case

This shameful case grew out of violations of the 1965 Voting Rights Act, violations which had been perpetrated during the course of 1996 by then Democratic National Chairman Don Fowler. Fowler had relied upon wildly outrageous, lying defamation of me, as a political smokescreen for his intentional violation of the Act. On August 2, 1996, I filed suit against both Fowler and relevant others, under the enforcement provisions of the 1965 Voting Rights Act. After a series of intervening developments, that case came before the Federal Court once again, during the course of 1999. The declaration of overt racism by the DNC's attorney, was first made in open court on August 16, 1999.

On that date, DNC attorney John Keeney, Jr. addressed Federal Judges David B. Sentelle, Thomas P. Jackson, and

Henry H. Kennedy: ". . .The Dissent [see *Morse v. Republican Party of Virginia,* 116 S. CT.1186 (1996)] is going to put into question the Constitutionality of the Act [the 1965 Voting Rights Act]. And that's a different question than the statutory interpretation of the act itself." The transcript makes it painstakingly clear, that Keeney was demanding a nullification of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, not merely spinning a misinterpretation of that statute. Keeney argued strenuously, that if the case were to come before the U.S. Supreme Court now, the majority of those justices, led by Justices Rehnquist, Scalia, and Thomas, would nullify the statute. Keeney was not merely attempting to lure me into prompting such an action by the majority of U.S. Supreme Court justices; he laid that scenario out in great detail during his August 16th argument.

Then, read the echoes of Keeney's argument for nullification of the Act in the November 1, 1999 opinion of Judge Sentelle: "But while the Act is unarguably a statute of importance . . . it should not be read to extend coverage that would interfere with core associational rights; specifically here, internal national party rules as followed by state parties in a covered jurisdiction." In other words, Sentelle's opinion is being read by the DNC bureaucracy as stating, that it is not a violation of the Act for the national party organization, as a private club, to direct state organizations to perpetrate a violation of the law. Did Sentelle intend to suggest, that perhaps the DNC should be prosecuted under RICO: for conspiring to cause state party organizations to violate the law? The forked-tongue faction of the DNC bureaucracy appears to wish to read Sentelle's argument so.

Indeed, the specific violation which Fowler perpetrated in 1996, was his demanding an unlawful change in the rules of the relevant state Democratic Party organizations. This was the complaint initially presented to the District Court by me, on August 2, 1996. This was the issue before the three-judge panel on August 16, 1999. Thus, both Keeney and Judge Sentelle's ruling were in plain error; if the court refused to consider Fowler in violation of the law, by his issuing that order, then, the other side of the issue remained: As I complained in 1996, and again before the three-judge panel, certainly the relevant state Democratic Party organizations were in violation of the statute in following Fowler's order. The same applies to new orders specifically targetting my candidacy, and my candidacy alone, recently issued by Fowler's DNC successors.

There is no margin for denying that Keeney's argument is nakedly racist. As Keeney, Judge Sentelle, and the DNC are fully aware, the 1965 Voting Rights Act was enacted, with support of President Lyndon Johnson, as a direct result of a series of scandalous incidents during the 1964 Democratic National Convention. During this convention, leading Democrats, including such ostensibly pro-Civil Rights figures as Joe Rauh and Walter Mondale, adopted and enforced a racist ruling of the Party Convention, against Fannie Lou Hamer and the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party. Fannie Lou Hamer was heaved out of the Convention premises.

The shocked reaction to those disgusting proceedings of the 1964 Democratic Convention, led to the subsequent adoption of the 1965 Voting Rights Act. This act was supported by President Lyndon Johnson. That Act addressed not only the follies of the 1964 Convention; the included target of the 1965 Voting Rights Act, was the former use of the argument that the Democratic Party is a "private club," and thus exempt from law otherwise applicable to electoral proceedings. This former practice of clubby racists within the Democratic Party, is the same doctrine which Keeney foisted upon Judge Sentelle.

At that 1964 Democratic Convention, Mondale et al. noted, that, despite personal regrets for their taking their outrageous actions against the Mississippi Freedom Demcratic Party, the Convention felt itself obliged to do this racist act, to ensure Party unity with the uncivilized elements within the national Democratic Party. So far, in the matter of recent actions on behalf of Fowler et al., the DNC as a whole, has turned back the clock to the follies of the 1964 Democratic Party's National Convention. Worse, it has not only condoned such racist actions, but the DNC as a whole has now created a bodyguard of lies to protect the DNC's unity with the avowed racists in its own ranks. All moral Democrats will now move to have that bodyguard of lies disbanded.

The DNC as a body has now been presented with conclusive evidence, that Fowler et al., acting through their legal representative, John Keeney, Jr., Esq., have perpetrated a racist action against the 1965 Voting Rights Act. In the light of the circumstances which led to the enactment of that 1965 law, there can be no doubt that the relevant actions of Fowler, Keeney, et al., were not only racist in content, but also in their clearly expressed intent.

The case poses the related question: are the sins of the father, the Justice Department's "Jack" Keeney, being visited upon DNC attorney John Keeney, Jr., his son?

The father, long a top-ranking permanent bureaucrat of the Justice Department's Criminal Division, has presided over a decades-long history of overtly racially motivated targetting of elected African-American officials. This operation, as run through the FBI in part, is notorious as "Operation Fruehmenschen," a racist dogma which argues that African-Americans tend, racially, to be morally incompetent to serve as public officials. During this period, Presidents and appointed Justice Department officials have come and gone, while old "Jack" Keeney continues to sit on top of this racially motivated legal lynch-mob run under his supervision. The official court transcript of August 16, 1999 attests, that old "Jack" Keeney's son, meanwhile, pursues kindred ends on the streets, and in the gutters of civil practice.

Thus, the DNC's choice of John Keeney, the son, as DNC attorney for a sensitive Civil Rights case, was itself an act of grave indiscretion, at the very least. That young John did

follow in the racialist tracks of "Operation Fruehmenschen," in the Fowler case, was the result of a piece of DNC bureaucratic folly which reached far beyond mere opportunistic foolishness and indiscretion.

In light of those indicated considerations which prompted the enactment of the 1965 Voting Rights law, the actions of both Fowler et al. and attorney Keeney are plainly racist. In his argument before Judge Sentelle, as the official court transcript shows, Keeney explicitly proposed, and argued for the nullification of the law. That Keeney appeal to the earlier anti-Civil-Rights, dissenting minority opinion of Chief Justice Rehnquist on a related matter, does not ameliorate, but aggravates the character of Keeney's own racist impulses: Rehnquist is on record, from his Arizona practice, as a long-standing, unimproved opponent of voters' Civil Rights as subsequently defined for today, by the circumstances, the substance, and letter of the Voting Rights Act.

It is a time to speak plain facts, even if many will protest that we are impolite in publicly stating inconvenient truths which they consider hurtfully insensitive to their personal feelings and collateral arrangements.

All of this is now fully apparent to the Democratic National Committee as a body. However, despite the evidence that a majority of DNC members were not only unaware of the racist actions of Fowler and Keeney, but most now privately deplored Keeney's pro-racist pleadings, the DNC members generally, have, so far, repeated the folly of Joe Rauh and Walter Mondale at the 1964 Democratic National Convention: they have, so far, decided "to go along, to get along," even at the price of making themselves complicit in lies and racist actions. These Democrats must seize the present opportunity to redeem the honor of their party and themselves.

So far, many among them prefer to declare factional solidarity with the racist elements in the DNC, tolerating outrageous lies issued from within the DNC, thus hoping to be able to pretend that they stand united in denying the undeniable, that Keeney's pleading constitutes an outrageously racist action by Fowler et al. They remind us of those, sometimes called "swivelheads," from Hitler days, who did not wish to know what that nearby smokestack represented. Most of these persons do not intend to be actually evil; but, these skittish folk do tend to look the other way, rather than face an uncomfortable reality.

So, until now, too many Democrats, who are not racists themselves, are, so far, professing their faith in that bodyguard of lies which the party's racists use as pretext for solidarity with what they should know to be both the racism and wild lies of the faction of the DNC behind Keeney's argument. They are behaving, at best, as what the New Testament would instruct us to see as veritably spewable, "lukewarm" Democrats.

2. The danger to the nation

It is a time to speak plain facts, even if many will protest that we are impolite in publicly stating inconvenient truths which they consider hurtfully insensitive to their personal feelings and collateral arrangements.

The painful truth is, that the "Emperor Bush" has no clothes. In other words, the truth is, that a pack of Wall Street's political ventriloquists are running the worst nationally recognized dummy available, Texas Governor George W. Bush, for the Republican Party's 2000 Presidential nomination. Similarly, at the same time, on the Democratic side, the putatively leading, but failing candidate, is an intrinsically unelectable, dishonorable man, who has shown himself, while Vice-President, by his crude thuggishness, by his backstabbing against the incumbent President, by his published writings, and by his stated policies, to be emotionally, morally, and intellectually unfit to serve in that office.

Those scandalous facts only scratch the surface of the issue. When we consider both the nature of the world crises now descending upon us, the survival of our nation now requires a President with the kind of patriotic outlook and concern for the general welfare which we recall from the greatest Presidents of the past, such as the Franklin Roosevelt of the Great Depression and war-time years.

We have come into a time in which the world is dominated by an explosive mixture of looming and escalating global and national crises, worse than anything experienced during the Presidencies of Herbert Hoover and Franklin Roosevelt. Therefore, what must we say of political machines and voters who propose to elect, as our next President, a person known, at his best, to be a poor, pathetic figure, such as either of those two "bozos" have shown themselves to be?

Admittedly, the excuse which sundry Republicans or Democrats offer in defense of their support for such candidates, is the customary rule of "go along, to get along." In short, the leading supporters of such candidates are supporting these bozos, despite the evidence that neither candidate is fit to serve as President. The commonplace apology which those supporters offer in their own defense, is that they are doing this, because that is the way one plays "the traditional rules of the party game." "Lord of the Flies, behold!"

Such is the way each "pays the dues" which define him or her as an acceptable player in the party as a political game. Such substitutes for truthfulness and justice have heretofore

generally defined the understood rules of politics as "closed-membership party clubs." It is past time to shuck such traditions and their damnable rules.

The simple truth is, that too many Americans—and others around today's world—are letting other people, such as the mass media, do their thinking for them. Inside the U.S.A. itself, as few as thirty percent of the eligible voters are often determining the outcome of local and statewide elections. Worse, in the U.S.A. itself, this thirty percent is currently dominated—usually—by voting blocs drawn from the upper twenty percent of the family-income brackets. That control over many elections by voting blocs from the upper twenty percent of the income-brackets, is key to understanding what Vice-President Al Gore and his co-thinker "Dick" Morris had defined as their "centrist," "triangulation" policies.

The fact, that the upper twenty percent of the nation's families, by income-bracket, claim half the total national income currently, is, even by itself, a shameful spectacle, a spectacle which, in effect of practice, makes a farce of even the bare names of "democracy" and "representative government." That is only the most superficial aspect of the political and moral disease lately corrupting our nation's electoral processes and law-making generally.

This same shift in patterns of income-brackets has much to do with the recent quarter-century trend toward reversing the 1960s and earlier gains of Civil Rights movement, and the rising incidence of increasingly overt displays of racism by our nation's judicial system. As the radical change to "post-industrial" utopianism, has sent our industrial and agricultural sources overseas, and as agricultural and industrial production vanishes from our national economy, the farmer and industrial operative, and their families, together with our senior citizens, have been pushed more and more into the categories of unwanted eaters. The trend is, that senior citizens should not burden us with their propensities for unduly prolonging their lives, and that the families of former skilled industrial and agricultural operatives should be content with working three or more jobs, for a total real income far less than what they used to gain with one or two.

The shift in sources and composition of national income associated with post-1971 long-term policy-making trends, toward "post-industrial" utopianism, has produced a vicious kind of class society, a society divided, economically, socially, and politically, between an upper twenty percent and a lower eighty percent. The increasing concentration of electoral power in the hands of the upper twenty percent, is a reflection of that gradual degeneration of our nation, from a republic, into the kind of oligarchical society which the founders of our constitutional republic viewed with revulsion, as the depraved state of affairs in the United Kingdom.

In this state of affairs, we should not be surprised to see the relatively worst choices of candidates as a trend fostered by the Wall Street bankers and lawyers who tend to control not only the major news media, but both the major parties, and also the top layers of the permanent bureaucracy in entire sections of the Federal government. That cabal of oligarchically-minded, parasitical bankers and lawyers in the Teddy Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson tradition of racism, does not wish Presidents who can actually think, but rather those who will do as such dummies are told to speak and act by the ventriloquists who own them. Nor should we be surprised, that such candidates will tend to represent a more or less outrightly racist attitude toward those "lower classes" which comprise the lower eighty percent of today's income-brackets.

The ability of this republic to survive, now depends upon the ability of the lower eighty percent to secure its constitutional rights to a government which promotes the general welfare. That can be accomplished only by a union of the overlapping organic leaderships of African-Americans, Hispanic-Americans, labor, farmers, senior citizens, and relevant others, to take over the control of the Democratic Party, and as much as possible of the Republican Party, too.

The present danger is, that in the collapse of the world's hopelessly bankrupt financial system, the financier oligarchy, supported by a desperation-ridden upper twenty percent of our income brackets, will attempt to foist what is in effect a fascist tyranny upon our United States and the world as well. There are immediate, rational, Franklin Roosevelt-style solutions for the world's financial crisis, but these mean that the financier oligarchy must accept a massive write-off of its present, nominal financial wealth; it means that that oligarchy must submit to government-directed, Franklin Roosevelt-style, financial reorganization of all salvageable financial and related institutions. It is that conflict between the desperado faction among oligarchical financier interests and the Franklin Roosevelt precedent, which is the battlefield on which all real politics will be fought out within the United States during the year 2000.

If the oligarchical faction could succeed in terrorizing the African-American constituents into tolerating the racist actions of Keeney et al., that intimidation of the African-American would tend to prevent any effective alliance of so-called minorities, labor, farmers, and senior citizens from taking back power in the national Democratic Party. If we can bring that coalition together today, we will be able to re-create the kind of response to crisis which President Franklin Roosevelt typifies in the party's memory. That is the only real chance we have, to save this nation under present conditions.

To make that kind of coalition work, we must have the kind of leadership provided by Presidential candidates who can actually think, as Governor George W. Bush can not, and Vice-President Al Gore so clearly will not. The fate of our nation and much of the world, too, depends upon it.