Al Gore, Jr. caught in another lie:
Gore, Sr. opposed civil rights

by Dennis Speed

Editor’s note: When the Philadelphia Tribune ran a story by Alabama author and radio personality R.D. Davis that reported that Al Gore, Sr. had authored an amendment to the Civil Rights Act of 1964, that would have prevented the Federal government from withdrawing funds to schools that continued the practice of segregation, longtime LaRouche associate Dennis Speed launched an investigation.

Ordinarily, it isn’t necessarily fair or reasonable to hold an individual responsible for the acts of their parents. But, this past July, Vice President and Democratic Presidential candidate Al Gore, Jr. attempted to corral support from African-Americans by reminding them that his father was “a great contributor to the cause of civil rights in the South.” The younger Gore even went so far as to claim that it was because of his firm support for the cause of civil rights, that his father ultimately lost his seat in the United States Senate.

One might wonder why Gore, Jr., who, before becoming Bill Clinton’s Vice President, had spent years, first in the U.S. House of Representatives and then in the U.S. Senate, doesn’t just rely on his own record. But, a close look at the Vice President’s record offers an explanation. Just a couple of weeks ago, John Keeney, the attorney for the Vice President’s cronies at the Democratic National Committee, Jr. — the son of Jack Keeney, perhaps best known as an intellectual author of the Department of Justice’s racist Operation Fruehmen-schen campaign of harassment and persecution of black elected and public officials — argued before a panel of Federal judges in Washington, D.C., that the Voting Rights Act of 1965 should have been declared “unconstitutional,” in an attempt to defend the decision by then-DNC Chairman Don Fowler, to lock duly elected delegates pledged to Lyndon LaRouche out of the 1996 Democratic National Convention.

And, there is little question that the Vice President would prefer that African-Americans not judge him by the genocidal action he took on the issue of saving AIDS victims in Africa, where his sabotage of less expensive life-saving treatment for South African victims of this deadly disease is well documented.

The result of Speed’s investigation tells the ugly truth about Al Gore’s lie: Sen. Albert Gore, Sr. opposed the measures to end segregation. In 1964, Senator Gore first tried to render the Civil Rights Act impotent. When that effort failed, he voted against the Civil Rights Act of 1964. In truth, the record of the Gore clan on civil rights issues reads more like a criminal’s “rap sheet.”

Democratic Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche, according to his campaign website, after reviewing Speed’s investigative report, directed his campaign staff to arrange for its broadest possible distribution. “Give it a name,” LaRouche said. “Call it ‘The Sins of the Father.’ ”

According to a story, first picked up by us from the Philadelphia Tribune newspaper, Al Gore, Sr. opposed the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Investigators for EIR followed up the story, searching out the actual documentation from the Congressional Record. The original story, filed by R.D. Davis, a “writer and radio talk show host from Huntsville, Alabama,” reported that Al Gore, Sr. had authored an amendment intended to refer the Civil Rights Act to the Judiciary Committee, in order to prevent the Federal government from withdrawing funds from schools that, despite their Federal funding, continued to practice segregation.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964, is not the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The two are sometimes confused, because Title I of the Civil Rights Act covers “voting rights,” and, indeed, should have been sufficient (as should also the U.S. Constitution) to ensure that Amelia Boynton Robinson and others did not have to lead the demonstrations that became necessary, nonetheless, in Selma, Alabama, throughout early 1965. The Civil Rights Act, also known at the time as Public Law 88-352, was stated thusly: “AN ACT, To enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodation, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.”

The act had originally been proposed by John F. Kennedy during June 1963, and was announced to the nation, in a public address by the President, in the aftermath of the Birmingham Children’s March and other events of May of that same year. The night of Kennedy’s announcement of his intention to fight for passage of such an act, Medgar Evers, a military veteran and National Association for the Advancement of
Colored People civil rights activist in Mississippi, was assassinated. Kennedy’s unpopularity in the South, prior to his fateful visit to Dallas, was largely attributed at the time to his sponsorship of the Civil Rights Act.

Republicans defend civil rights

Congressional deliberations on this matter began as early as June 5, 1963, when a Republican (and clearly pre-Gingrich) Senate conference committee drafted a document, which stated, in part, that it is the consensus of the Senate Republican conference that: “The Federal government, including the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial branches, has a solemn duty to preserve the rights, privileges, and immunities of citizens of the United States in conformity with the Constitution, which makes every native-born and naturalized person a citizen of the United States, as well as the State in which he resides. Equality of rights and opportunities has not been fully achieved in the long period since the 14th and 15th Amendments to the Constitution were adopted, and this inequality and lack of opportunity, and the racial tension which they engender, are out of character with the spirit of a nation pledged to justice and freedom.

“The Republican members of the U.S. Senate, in this 88th Congress, reaffirm and reassert the basic principles of the party with respect to civil rights, and further affirm, that the President, with the support of Congress, consistent with its duties as defined in the Constitution, must protect the rights of all U.S. citizens regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin.”

The ‘Gore amendment’

While the fact that Republican Presidential candidate Barry Goldwater voted against the Civil Rights Act in June 1964, is usually remembered as the move that “sank” his Presidential campaign, and marked him, probably unfairly, as a racist, writer Davis correctly emphasizes, that no one points out the nefarious role of Al Gore, Sr. in trying to destroy the legislation’s effectiveness. What Gore’s amendment did, was: a) to avoid any financial penalty for segregation’s continuance with respect to certain Federal grant programs, and other Federal aid; b) attempt to put the timetable for desegregation into the hands of the racist judges of the South, many of them, of course, Southern Jurisdiction Scottish Rite Freemasons, and allow “Federal district judges” to determine if, for example, a school were in compliance with the Civil Rights codes as interpreted by, not a federal Civil Rights Commission, but by the local Confederate “judicial talent.”

The “Gore amendment” was to be a reversal of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, “Nondiscrimination in Federally Assisted Programs,” and specifically of section 601 of that act, which stated: “No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal assistance.” Title VI provided that compliance with the act’s provision would be enforced “by the termination of or refusal to grant or to continue assistance under such program or activity to any recipient” failing to “comply with such requirement.” Gore’s amendment would add a new section,
called section 606, to say: “No action shall be taken pursuant to this title which terminates, reduces, denies, or discontinues, or which has the effect of terminating reducing, denying, or discontinuing, Federal financial assistance for public education or the school lunch program in any school district unless such school district, or official thereof, shall have failed to comply with an order by a United States district court relating to desegregation of public schools.”

Gore had attempted to argue, unpersuasively, that he was deeply concerned about how the Southern African-American poor population would be affected, if a segregated school were to lose its school lunch program! Then, as well as (hopefully) today, this was seen as the height of cynicism. In an exchange redolent with the tortured logic we have come to expect from Al, Jr., Gore stated, during the debate on his amendment:

“This week an order was issued affecting Memphis, Tennessee. The court ordered that the schools be completely integrated by September 1966. That would appear to me to be a reasonably short time for a city of 600,000 people to complete this great change in its school program.

“I daresay that the administration would not cut off aid in that case. I only say that we should write into the bill a provision that they shall not have the authority to do so, if Memphis, Tennessee complies with the order of the Federal district court. In Nashville, Tennessee, the court-approved plan of desegregation provided for desegregation of one grade a year.

Nashville’s schools are now desegregated up to the seventh grade. But Nashville still has some grades which are not desegregated” (emphasis added).

Obviously, Gore had forgotten the famous remark made by Thurgood Marshall in the 1950s pertaining to the “timely” integration of public schools, as Marshall successfully argued this in the Brown v. The Topeka Board of Education case of 1954. “I think that asking for integration of the Southern school system after 90 years (1865-1954) is pretty gradual.” Second, it was to the exercise of the power of the Federal government, particularly as that would have been wielded by Attorney General Robert Kennedy, brother of the slain President, to enforce integration through the courts, as well as through the withdrawal of funds, that Gore sought to insulate the South from.

The true objections

It was the “un-Reconstructed” Senator Ellender of Louisiana who stated, most plainly, the true objections of Gore, and other Southerners, to the bill. “The South acted within the law with respect to school segregation. It has done so since the Supreme Court decided the case of Plessy against Ferguson in 1892 which provided that separate but equal facilities conformed to the Constitution. Our schools were constructed to comply with an order by a United States district court relating to desegregation, provided that they shall not have the authority to do so, if Memphis, Tennessee complies with the order of the Federal district court. In Nashville, Tennessee, the court-approved plan of desegregation provided for desegregation of one grade a year.

The Plessy case was followed by at least 30 other cases from that date until the Brown case of 1954. Since the Court reversed the separate but equal facility doctrine, we from the South have been attempting to find a satisfactory solution to the problem of racial antagonism brought about by the Court. It will come in time, I hope. We are not going to help the process very much by sending the long arm of the Federal government down there” (emphasis added).

Perhaps because he could smell the Confederate duplicity in the “Gore amendment,” even Barry Goldwater refused to vote for it. Goldwater’s objections, more along the lines of fear of sweeping Federal police-state powers, were not those of the Southern Democrats, who almost to a man voted against the Civil Rights Act of 1964. (However, it should also be recalled, that it was Lyndon Johnson, a Southerner, who hailed from Texas, the state in which the President had been shot, who proposed this bill, as well as the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The late Sen. Ralph Yarborough, who more recently was in touch with the LaRouche movement up to the time of his death, had also voted for the 1964 Civil Rights Act.)

In the U.S. Senate, the vote for the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was, on the Republican side, 27 for, 6 against, and on the Democratic side, the vote was 46 for, 21 against. Gore stood shoulder to shoulder (and cheek to cheek) with his Confederates, and voted against the bill, after his attempt to sabotage it came to naught. That is the ugly truth behind the lie, told as recently as this past July, by Vice President Al Gore, that his father was a “great contributor to the cause of civil rights in the South.”