

ership Council, the very group which Kennedy himself denounced in 1996, when he said in a much-noted speech that the nation did not need “two Republican parties.”

On the other side of the power struggle is a grouping tied to former President Bill Clinton, whom many see as making a move to establish a political machine. Being an intelligent man, Clinton and his associates can see clearly the disaster in the making of the Kerry campaign, as the presumptive candidate keeps failing to develop either a message, or an enthusiastic following within the core Democratic constituencies of labor, farmers, and civil rights.

Clinton is still able to draw the largest crowds of any Democratic figure, and he seems inclined to utilize his popularity for the benefit of the party in this current election. The former President knows you have to open up the party, and stir up the base, if you are going to generate the excitement to win an election campaign against George W. Bush.

The fourth grouping is that which is actually based in the lower 80% of income brackets, the following of FDR Democrat Lyndon LaRouche. LaRouche’s approach to solving the economic and strategic crises, and his record of forecasting and analyzing the crises in these areas, are watched carefully by many that are turned off or simply upset by the Party’s—and Kerry’s—repudiation of the legacy of Franklin Roosevelt. “It would be insane for the Democratic Party to cut LaRouche and his constituency out,” one of the LaRouche-watchers is known to have said. And yet the party continues to do so.

The Opposition

The most flagrant example of the sabotage which the opponents of Clinton, and LaRouche, have carried out against and within the Kerry campaign, is the floating of the John McCain option. By this scenario, Kerry would effectively forge a “national unity” ticket, by bringing Republican Senator John McCain (R-Ariz.), also a Vietnam War veteran, onto the ticket, thus allegedly denying President Bush one of his crucial constituencies.

While the Kerry-McCain option has been “in the air” for more than a year now, it has only just recently received high-level backing. The most notable promotion for it came from senior *Washington Post* writer David Ignatius, who wrote a column on May 21 entitled “The McCain Choice.” Ignatius stated that Kerry by himself can’t get it together to win, and therefore, must hook up with McCain, because “there is something of greatness about him [McCain].”[!] He symbolizes bipartisanship, and “the country needs him.” Things are so serious now, that there can be no waiting until November, Ignatius went on. “The logic of a Kerry-McCain ticket isn’t to win an election, but to provide leadership for a divided country at war.”

Ignatius was at pains to convince McCain to agree to this proposal, since so far, the Arizona Senator has declared that he is “not interested.”

John McCain is no stranger to consorting with Democrats.

As early as 2002, various journals were promoting McCain as a “Bull Moose” candidate, who would run in combination with that favorite Democrat of William F. Buckley’s, Joe Lieberman, if it turned out that George W. Bush did not carry out the imperial war agenda which the neo-con faction wanted. Or perhaps, these “bull moose” promoters said, McCain run against Lieberman and Bush, to ensure Lieberman’s election.

Lyndon LaRouche called the shots on McCain at that point, exposing the “hand grenade”-type behavior of McCain at the Wehrkunde security conference in Munich in February 2002. McCain used his speech at that event to demand a “day of reckoning” for Saddam Hussein—and for any European government that refused to back a war for regime change!

Back on the home front, McCain worked with Lieberman to egg the President on into the war which is now blowing up in our faces. His policy today is no better.

Thanks in large part to the LaRouche campaign’s aggressive expose of Lieberman and McCain, who shared major debts to organized crime as well as an agenda of warmongering, McCain’s first Democratic partner collapsed politically even before the primaries started. Lieberman’s Democratic Leadership Council (DLC) was exposed as a virtual Republican Trojan Horse. Thus, for Democratic “strategists” to currently raise the flag for McCain once again, is virtually suicidal—not to mention dead wrong in direction.

The FDR Issue

So far, the real fighters advising the Kerry campaign have avoided taking on the chief issue publicly: the need to bring in LaRouche around his FDR-style approach to the crisis. Those who have advised Kerry to lay low and wait for Bush to destroy himself have stayed on top, insisting that a “statesman-like” approach, and a lot of money, will ultimately pay off.

On May 26, none other than loser, and LaRouche-hater, Al Gore entered the fray, with a strident speech against the Iraq war, and for the resignation of a number of the key culprits from the Administration, including Paul Wolfowitz, Doug Feith, and Donald Rumsfeld. In the context of the behind-the-scenes fight over opening up the party to LaRouche, Gore’s speech must be seen as an attempt to block that effort, and cover up for the disaster of the Kerry campaign.

Meanwhile, Kerry carried out a dismal performance in his major foreign policy speech of May 27, in which he echoed one phrase after the other directly from President Bush: taking the war to the enemy, staying the course, and other such generalities.

**To reach us on the Web:
www.larouchepub.com**

Latest FEC Report Shows It's Kerry and LaRouche

by Anita Gallagher

Lyndon LaRouche and John Kerry are in a two-way race for the support of Democratic Party's base nationwide, according to the latest "May Monthly" Report which all Democratic Presidential Pre-candidates must file with the Federal Election Commission. LaRouche has 41,494 itemized individual contributions and Kerry has 108,523, while Dennis Kucinich is a distant third, with 8,997. The rest of the candidates have quit.

The FEC defines "itemized individual contributions" as every contribution from an individual who has given \$200 or more to a candidate. For LaRouche, this statistic shows a nationwide base of repeat contributors among the lower 80% of the population by family income bracket, who are mobilized in an ongoing way for campaign activity, which surpasses that of any other candidate.

That LaRouche has the Democratic base of the "lower 80%" of the population ranked by income, is shown in his lowest average itemized individual contribution figure among all the candidates: \$143.46, compared to Kerry's average contribution of \$869.36, and \$263.81 for Dennis Kucinich. This is the base which allowed Franklin Roosevelt to take over a rotten Democratic Party in 1932, and propelled him to victory.

The ongoing mobilization of LaRouche's contributors is also seen by comparing LaRouche's "un-itemized individual contributions" total with those of the other candidates. LaRouche has un-itemized individual contributions (from individuals who have not yet contributed \$200 to his campaign) of \$1.6 million—only 21% of the total \$7.5 million LaRouche has raised from individuals. This compares to Kerry's \$30 million in un-itemized contributions, or 29% of his total \$105

million raised from individuals; and Kucinich's \$4.2 million in un-itemized individual contributions, 61% of his total \$6.8 million in individual contributions. Thus, many of the contributors to Kerry and Kucinich have not become *repeat* contributors, who constitute an active base of support.

So Kerry's \$105 million raised from individuals, though 14 times the \$7.5 million LaRouche has raised from individuals, does not dwarf it, because Kerry has only 2.5 times the number of LaRouche's individual contributions, and the latter's come from the core constituencies of "have-nots" which today's Democratic Party leadership has abandoned. The core of a mass movement for the Presidency is repeat contributor-activists from the lower 80% of the population by income.

LaRouche Leads Kerry in 11 States

It is not surprising, then, that LaRouche has more itemized individual contributions than Kerry in 11 states: Alaska, Alabama, Delaware, Idaho, Indiana, Montana, North Dakota, Nebraska, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming.

In three of the four states still to hold primaries in June, LaRouche has more itemized individual contributions than Kerry: Alabama (June 1), South Dakota (June 1), and Montana (June 8). In both North and South Dakota, LaRouche leads Kerry not only in the number of itemized individual contributions, but in the absolute dollar amount raised. LaRouche has 181 itemized individual contributions and \$28,920 to Kerry's 40 contributions and \$12,885 raised in North Dakota. In South Dakota, LaRouche has 362 itemized individual contributions and \$69,645, compared to Kerry's 67 contributions and \$37,825.

LaRouche's campaign fundraising shows that only his Presidential campaign has the mass base to defeat George W. Bush—the dumbest man ever to occupy the Presidency. The Democratic Party needs LaRouche's mass base, as well as his policy solutions and international credibility, to win. The Party's current obsession with raising big money coheres with an idiotic idea that it can win an election without votes. LaRouche and his mass base must be included in the Democratic Party's nomination process now, to beat Bush in November.

TABLE 1
Presidential Candidates' Individual Contributions**

Candidate	Itemized Indiv. Contributions to Date	Itemized Individual Contributions, April '04	\$ Amount Indiv. Contrib. to Date	\$ Amount Indiv. Contrib., April '04	Average Itemized Indiv. Contrib.	Unitemized Contributions to Date	Cumulative Federal Matching Funds
LaRouche	41,494	1,651	\$7,551,917	\$248,619	\$143.46	\$1,683,394	\$1,276,465
Kerry*	108,523	29,940	\$105,861,659	\$30,831,300	\$869.36	\$30,357,224	—
Kucinich	9,852	855	\$6,816,766	\$257,180	\$263.81	\$4,247,204	\$2,413,078

*Estimated.

**All figures inclusive of May Monthly FEC Reports.
Source: Federal Election Commission.