

Bush and Me-Too Kerry Campaign To Beat Themselves

by Nancy Spannaus

Recent performances by President George W. Bush and his presumptive opponent in the November 2004 Presidential elections, Sen. John Kerry, have led Democratic Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche to remark that he is not running against these men as opponents; they are running against themselves. Unless LaRouche is brought into the equation, the loser is the American nation.

LaRouche has proposed to remedy the situation by holding debates on the strategic crisis with Senator Kerry. This would be the only way to break the consensus now being enforced by both the Republican and Democratic parties, in which the strategic realities of the global economic-financial breakdown crisis, and the threat of global warfare emanating from the pre-emptive war against Iraq, have been put off the agenda. Apparently, the Democrats and Republicans have agreed that there will be no financial crash before the November elections. Given the global instabilities and bankruptcy of the system, this is nothing short of insane.

So far, the Kerry campaign has not responded to LaRouche's proposal, and candidate Kerry has instead dug himself deeper and deeper into the muck of "me-tooism," on the war and the economy. With such a free ride, the Cheney-run Bush Administration has flung itself headlong into accelerating the crises in the Middle East and Asia, and kept up its insane "recovery" propaganda, despite clear indications that its phony statistics will boomerang into an interest rate rise that finally pops the bubble.

The question looms: who will break the cycle of lunacy that threatens to destroy the United States?

The World's Dumbest President

In a March 29 statement, LaRouche argued that the leading political issue of 2004, after the onrushing depression, was the question: "Are the U.S. voters so silly that they would

re-elect a President whose one and only endearing charm, is that he is rightly perceived, more or less world-wide, as the dumbest man in the history of the Oval Office?" The President has done nothing to shake that appellation over the recent two weeks. Granted that his Svengali Dick Cheney was out of town, Bush still outdid himself in the idiotic appearance of his comments on the declassified Aug. 6, 2001 Presidential Daily Briefing item, released on April 12. The President said, that since the memo did not mention a specific time, place, or method of attack by al-Qaeda, it had no active intelligence. He added that the intelligence on planned airplane hijackings— included in the briefings!—was no good because it didn't mention crashing into buildings, but only mentioned forcing the release of one of the 1993 World Trade Center plotters from prison.

Asked, during his April 13 press conference, about the Administration's actions to prevent the 9/11 disaster, and what he or his Administration could have done differently, Bush was downright goofy: He virtually scratched his head perplexedly, and said that he really couldn't think of anything at all.

On Iraq *per se*, the President simply tried to bull his way through, insisting that "failure is unthinkable," and that the United States could not leave because it would "lose respect." He reiterated the threats against radical cleric Moqtadar al-Sadr, which have further inflamed the situation. But, when it came to the question, to whom would America hand over sovereignty on June 30, the President effectively passed the buck to United Nations envoy to Iraq Lakhdar Brahimi, as the person who would decide what kind of ruling authority would receive this sovereignty. Ironic, from an Administration which has insisted on going it alone.

To say that President Bush was in a situation of denial, would be no exaggeration.

Even worse was his behavior on April 14, when he held his Rose Garden press conference with Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon, and lent U.S. support to Israel's demand that its acquisition of the Occupied Territories by force, be ratified as "reality," despite the body of international law and United Nations resolutions which demand Israel give up these territories. The President was like the fool who lights a match in a room full of gasoline. For a moment, it improves visibility—until the whole room explodes. In this case, it is the entire Middle East that is poised to explode, with blowback on Israel as well. To count this as a gold star on the Bush Administration's resume, is just plain nuts.

Terry McAuliffe's Rotten Stew

While George Bush may have an excuse for his idiocies, Senator Kerry is intelligent enough to know better. There is perhaps no clearer indication that Kerry's campaign is currently being run by Terry McAuliffe's corrupt bunch at the Democratic National Committee, than his April policy statements on the economy and foreign policy. Kerry's April 7 "major economic address" at Georgetown University was a paean to "fiscal responsibility," in the tradition of the Democratic Leadership Council-dominated DNC. He emphasized "fiscal discipline," the balanced budget, and other nonsense which neglected the fundamental bankruptcy of the financial system, and the FDR-style approach needed to solve it. As is typical even of good Democrats, Kerry gave credence to the "boom years" of the Clinton Administration—which, in fact, saw the rapid stoking of the financial bubble which is now in the blowout phase.

Even worse was the presumptive Democratic nominee's pandering to the Bush Administration in his opinion column on the Iraq war a few days later. In an oped in the April 13 *Washington Post*, Kerry purported to present a "strategy for Iraq." After a nod to the fact that the Administration made "misjudgments" in its approach to the Iraq war, which are costing the United States too much money and too many lives, Kerry rushed to state that he would do nothing to change the premises of that approach. Instead, he emphasized, he wanted to let the "extremists attacking our forces know they will not succeed in dividing America, or in sapping American resolve, or in forcing the premature withdrawal of U.S. troops." If our commanders request more troops, "we should deploy them," he said, and convince others to put more "boots on the ground" to help us out. Kerry went so far as to endorse the idea of NATO creating "a new out-of-area operation for Iraq under the lead of a U.S. commander."

In fact, nothing that Kerry wrote differed substantially from what President Bush said at his press conference that very evening—up to and including the resolve to keep the United States in military control over Iraq, even if the United Nations can be convinced to take over civilian direction.

EIR's sources emphasize that the reasoning behind Kerry's impotence on this question is that he doesn't want to be

caught sounding anything like LaRouche, and therefore will not come forward with even the straightforward criticisms of the lies about non-existent weapons of mass destruction, which he has previously referenced. Even as Secretary of State Powell is admitting, implicitly, that LaRouche was right when he wrote that "Powell was lied to" before his February 2003 presentation to the UN, Senator Kerry acts as though he has to rally behind the losing, fraudulent, immoral war. If the population is offered such a "Bush-lite," is it really going to rally around a Democrat?

Unfortunately, Kerry proceeded to make an equally serious blunder in his positive response to President Bush's deal with Ariel Sharon, sanctioning the Israeli seizure of lands during the 1967 war.

Is It Fatal?

There is no question but that a re-election of the Bush-Cheney team—or their seizure of power through cancellation or rigging of the 2004 elections—would be fatal for the United States and the world. And despite the weakness of the Bush-Cheney team which is occasionally now showing up in the polls, there is no certainty that a re-election might not take place.

The fact is that Senator Kerry is destroying both himself, and the Democratic Party's ability to mobilize. His reliance on the moneybags in Hollywood, suburbia, and elsewhere belies the fact that he is currently not orienting to mobilizing the population in the lower 80% of income brackets, the forgotten men and women of the FDR-era Democratic Party constituency.

After reading Kerry's April 7 economic speech, Lyndon LaRouche didn't mince words. "This speech is one of the most foolish pieces of random, meaningless babbling I've seen from a serious person in a long time," LaRouche said. "The question is, is this a reparable collapse, or not? Could Kerry come back, after his evasion of the real issues, and then plunging head-first into the manure-pile, with this crazy Georgetown speech? This is an absolute disaster, it's a career breaker. Probably the only thing that would save him," LaRouche went on, "is if, suddenly, the Democratic Party were to change its policy, and just have Kerry and me have some debates; that's the only way to save it. He and I are now the leading candidates still in the campaign. And therefore, there should be a public debate (maybe it could be private beforehand, but it should be public).

"This should be a public discussion, not something where we're answering press questions," LaRouche added. "A classical debate, on what should the policy of the Democratic Party be? What should the policy of the United States be? The time has come for that debate. If people don't want it, and they say they're not going to do it, then Kerry's finished. The only way to get him really back in the race as a credible alternative to that dummy George Bush, is this."