

Democratic Party Is In Political Disarray

by Nancy Spannaus

This is not the first time that the Democratic Party's banker-run leadership has decided to ram a candidate down the party's throats early in the election year, only to see the choice blow up in their faces. One of those times was 1984, with the "early endorsement" of Walter Mondale. This year, Terry McAuliffe's orchestration of a primary process that would pick a "winner" by early March, has resulted in a political disaster which promises to be just as bad.

The pundits, Democrat and Republican, are agog at the ability of presumptive Democratic Party Presidential nominee John Kerry to "blow it." Faced with a golden opportunity to contrast clear vision and principles from the FDR tradition of the party, with the all-around incompetence and arrogant venality of the Cheney Administration, the Kerry campaign is putting its message forward with all the oomph of a "me, too."

What Bill Clinton Knows

While the polls show Kerry barely holding his own—despite the enormous scandal facing the Administration's Iraq war effort—the even-more telling symptom comes in looking at the ongoing Democratic state primary elections. These continue to show a solid 25-30% or more of the party faithful voting *against* Kerry in many states, despite the fact that most of the other candidates have dropped out of the race! Even more telling is the fact that the voter participation has sunk to what appears to be new lows, hitting a level between 7% and 15% of registered Democrats in Kentucky, and 15-20% in a number of other states.

As the Kerry campaign keeps failing to get what they call "traction," a number of groupings have emerged within the Democratic Party, vying to take control of the candidacy. On top, for the moment, is the DNC-McAuliffe grouping, with its centrist "professionals" like Mark Penn and Bob Shrumm, who are advising Kerry to "stay cautious," and not strike out with a bold challenge to the President on Iraq policy, in particular.

Also on the inside track is the Kennedy grouping, which includes both principled liberals, and a strong component of operatives controlled by the Venetian-style banking group, à la Schachtian banker and Democratic string-puller Felix Rohatyn of Lazard Frères. This latter grouping is vectored in the losing direction of appealing to the upper 20% of income brackets, as the known voting "power" in the party. Rohatyn himself is the leading representative of the Democratic Lead-

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**