

standards, while Strauss insisted that “those who are fit to rule are those who realize there is no morality and that there is only one natural right, the right of the superior to rule over the inferior. . . . You want a crowd that you can manipulate like putty.”

Drury also told Lobe that Strauss’s system of rule depended on getting the population to believe in an enemy image. “He maintains that if no external threat exists, then one has to be manufactured. . . . In Strauss’s view, you have to fight all the time [to survive]. In that respect, it’s very Spartan. Peace leads to decadence. Perpetual war, not perpetual peace, is what Straussians believe in.” This is the doctrine of the Straussians in Washington—such as Wolfowitz, Kristol, Shulsky and Schmitt—which leads them to pursue “aggressive, belligerent foreign policy.” Drury criticized the Bush Administration, which she accused of having “no use for liberalism and democracy, but they’re conquering the world in the name of liberalism and democracy.”

In the May 7 edition of the *New York Observer*, Joe Conason made a cynical stab at the Straussian gang surrounding Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld. “The genius of Donald Rumsfeld and his deputies in the Defense Department,” Conason wrote, dripping with sarcasm, “is currently among the mainstream media’s favorite themes. According to the conventional viewpoint, their military strategy in Iraq was practically flawless, their political instincts are masterful, and their philosophical grounding is deep. (Some of them have even read Leo Strauss). They’re just undeniably brilliant.”

A Fight to the Bitter End

The sudden outburst of enthusiasm for Lyndon LaRouche’s epistemological war against the neo-con cabal, from some powerful elements in the American political institutions, is a significant indication that more and more people are awakening to the extraordinary danger that the Straussian “perpetual war party” poses to the very survival of the United States as a constitutional republic. Prior to the outbreak of the Iraq War in March, there was a tremendous degree of naiveté about the power of the neo-conservatives and their grip on such top Administration decision-makers as Defense Secretary Rumsfeld and Vice President Dick Cheney—neither of whom personally has the profile of an ideological neo-con (although Rumsfeld has long been associated with leading Strauss disciple Robert Goldwin, former Dean of St. John’s College; he was Rumsfeld’s deputy both at NATO and at the Gerald Ford White House; Goldwin is now with the neo-con “Temple of Doom,” the American Enterprise Institute).

The question remains, however: Will the present momentum continue? Will U.S. political institutions recognize that the Straussians are universal fascists, and will continue to exploit the Sept. 11, 2001 “Reichstag Fire” to impose their political will on the President, until they are thoroughly purged by the counter-coup that Lyndon LaRouche has been calling for?

Earth to DNC: LaRouche Is Number 1 in Support

by Anita Gallagher

The Democratic National Committee and the mendacious U.S. press are sounding an ugly dissonance with reality, as they struggle to hype and stage Democratic Presidential candidate forums in Ohio on May 17 and Wisconsin on June 13, while so far excluding Lyndon LaRouche—the candidate who leads Sen. John Kerry (D-Mass.), Sen. John Edwards (D-N.C.), and all the other “major candidates,” in money raised, number of individual contributions, and number of contributors in those states! Nor is this a Midwestern regional anomaly, for LaRouche leads the other nine Democratic candidates in number of individual contributions nationwide, according to the Federal Election Commission (FEC) figures through March 31, 2003.

LaRouche also leads in all categories of support in Iowa, traditionally the first state in the nation to choose a Presidential candidate, and thus bestow early momentum to the winner.

Speaking to the press on April 29, LaRouche explained, “The Federal Election Commission reports, and our supplementary information on the extended support means, that, in terms of contributions, contributors, I’m the number-one candidate, presently, for the Democratic nomination for 2004.

“Now, under those circumstances, no party can claim to be serious, and keep the frontrunner, the current frontrunner in the campaign, from the controversy,” LaRouche told the South Carolina News Network on April 28, respecting his exclusion from ABC-TV’s May 3 debate there. Reality swiftly imposed its own penalty on ABC-TV, when the network effectively admitted how dull its “debate” would be, by cancelling the long-planned live coverage!

The organized-crime-linked Democratic Leadership Council, founded with seed-money from Michael Steinhardt, the son of Meyer Lansky’s jewel fence, has taken over the Democratic National Committee. The DLC exists to expunge the influence of Franklin D. Roosevelt from the party, and its attempts to make the Democrats a “second Republican Party” have resulted in defeat after defeat. For example, the Democratic Party loss of Congressional seats in the 2002 mid-term elections, was only the third time in 100 years when the opposition party failed to *win* seats in mid-term elections; the nearest precedent is the Republicans’ massive loss of seats in 1934, after two years of FDR’s leadership. The DLC-dominated DNC is exerting heavy, if bizarre, pressure on the state Democratic parties to act like fools, and

exclude LaRouche.

Associated Press asked LaRouche in an April 28 campaign interview, what his fundraising goal was. He replied, "I'm going for the big one—a giant machine." LaRouche explained that his funds are generally raised in small amounts, and are a result of mass organizing in the streets. The campaign, in that way, has a high impact in the population, he said.

LaRouche Leads in Debate States

The other candidates' strategy is the opposite. Most of them are Congressional incumbents, so they raise money from people in their home states, and deep-pocket donors in a few states like New York, California, Washington, D.C., and its Maryland and Virginia suburbs—in order to spend it in the rest of the nation.

Iowa is a good example of a state where the candidates expect to *spend* money, rather than build a grass-roots machine, which, among other manifestations of support, contributes money to the candidate. In Iowa, LaRouche has raised \$24,721 in 212 individual contributions from 43 people. Senator Kerry is a distant second, with \$11,000, followed by former Vermont Gov. Howard Dean with \$7,750, Rep. Dennis Kucinich (Ohio) with \$1,711, and Rep. Dick Gephardt (Mo.) with \$1,000 from three donors. In 2000, Gephardt won the Iowa primary.

In Ohio, a fight is being waged to include LaRouche on May 17. A letter, urging "fair and open debate on the critical issues facing our nation and our party," is being circulated to include LaRouche, and has been signed by former Democratic Presidential candidate and U.S. Sen. Eugene McCarthy (Minn.), as well as state legislators from Ohio, six city council members, and ten labor leaders.

LaRouche leads in Ohio in money raised, number of individual contributions, and number of contributors, with \$100,622, broken down into 660 individual contributions, and 159 contributors. Edwards is a close second with \$99,700, but only 100 contributions from 85 contributors. Next are Gephardt (\$57,950), Sen. Joe Lieberman (\$42,000), Kerry (\$23,900), Kucinich (\$12,650), Dean (\$8,401), and New York Rev. Al Sharpton (\$1,020). Sen. Bob Graham (Fla.) and former Illinois Sen. Carol Moseley-Braun have no Ohio contributions.

In Wisconsin, where the Democratic Party will host a candidates weekend on June 13-14, LaRouche has raised more than *twice* the amount of any other candidate, with \$52,476, in 422 contributions, from 87 individuals—showing a continuing self-activation by the same base, not one-shot contributors. Lieberman is a distant second (\$23,500), then Dean (\$8,986), Edwards (\$4,300), Kucinich (\$2,500), and Kerry (\$500). Four of the candidates have no contributions from Wisconsin: Gephardt, Graham, Moseley-Braun, and Sharpton. The LaRouche in 2004 campaign noted that all contributions figures are based on FEC data through March 31, 2003.

Rumsfeld's Reorganization

Will Congress Defend The Constitution?

by Carl Osgood

The U.S. Congress has a make-or-break opportunity to live up to its Congressional responsibilities by shooting down Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld's "emergency" legislation, which would effectively scrap the 100-year-old Civil Service system, eliminate collective bargaining rights, and greatly weaken protections against discrimination, and strong-arming of whistle blowers, among the nearly 700,000 civilian Defense Department employees. At stake in the fight over H.R. 1836, The Civil Service and National Security Personnel Improvement Act, is more than the fate of Federal employees. The larger issue is whether Congress will stand up on a bipartisan basis to defeat a flagrantly unconstitutional power-grab by the same Straussian gang in the Executive Branch that was behind the Iraq War and the drive to permanently transform the United States from a Constitutional Republic into a caricature of the Napoleonic or Roman Empire.

The Rumsfeld-Wolfowitz cabal at the Pentagon is dead set on ramming through this piece of fascist legislation (Adolf Hitler imposed almost the identical civil service "reforms" in Nazi Germany in Spring 1933, as part of his consolidation of dictatorial power). In a clear signal of this, Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz himself appeared before the House Armed Services Committee on May 1, and the House Government Reform Committee on May 6, the day before that committee's markup. Other big guns the Pentagon deployed to turn up the heat on Capitol Hill included Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Richard Myers, Vice Chairman Gen. Peter Pace, Chief of Naval Operations Adm. Vern Clark, and Undersecretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness David Chu. The four hearings—an April 29 hearing before the Government Reform Committee's Civil Service Subcommittee, the May 6 hearing of the full committee, and two hearings of the Armed Services Committee on May 1 and May 2—were highlighted by sharp attacks by the Democrats of both committees, who attacked both the bill's railroad speed and its content.

That railroad speed was shown by the fact that the bill was first sent up by the Defense Department on April 11, just as the Congress was trying to get out of town for the Easter recess. Members of the House, upon returning from the recess on April 28, were confronted with a schedule that called for a Civil Service Subcommittee and a full committee markup