

## Why Did the Senate Democrats Join the Anti-Kerry Campaign?

by Tony Papert

On Wednesday, June 21, the pustule of a weeks-old scandal broke open on the floor of the U.S. Senate, when it became plain that most Senate Democrats had either joined or condoned a strongarm campaign against John Kerry of Massachusetts, to try to force him to drop legislation requiring withdrawal of U.S. troops from Iraq within a year (subject to certain exclusions and guarantees).

But because Kerry persisted regardless, they trooped up one after another to denounce him from the Senate microphone, all insisting in effect that the war continue indefinitely. I, for one, could barely believe what I was hearing,—but if you doubt it, read the *Congressional Record*. (At the end, on Thursday morning, Kerry got just 13 votes, including his own and that of his cosponsor, Russ Feingold of Wisconsin.)

It is relevant to this fiasco that the proverbial baker's dozen of new Democratic think-tanks have sprung up recently, each with its website and its own statement of purpose. But all the statements of purpose are identical: namely, that of fostering and spreading the "big ideas" needed for a long-term Democratic majority, in imitation of the process by which Heritage, the American Enterprise Institute, and the other right-wing think-tanks supposedly paved the way, with their "ideas," for the current failed Cheney/Bush Administration. (The notion of imitating the "neo-conservatives" in this way, has been promoted extensively by Ford Foundation-funded leftist groups.)

**www.democracyjournal.org**, led by the newcomers Kenneth Baer and Andrei Cherny features: "THE NEW BIOPOLITICS: . . . with a male baby boom in Asia and a baby bust in Europe, Americans now may need to worry about what's happening in foreign bedrooms, as well. . . . THE WEALTH OF NEIGHBORHOODS, by Gar Alperovitz:

What does it mean when more workers own their companies than belong to labor unions?" And so forth.

**www.thedemocraticstrategist.org** is led by the unlikely trio of Democratic Leadership Council (DLC) Straussian William Galston; a new name: Ruy Teixeira; and Democrat Jim Carville's partner Stan Greenberg. It features, inter alia, "REPLACING THE BATTLEGROUND MENTALITY WITH THE MAPCHANGER ATTITUDE IN THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY," and "SWING IDEAS, NOT SWING VOTERS."

**www.ndn.org** is a rechristening of the New Democrat Network, which is itself another name for the Democratic Leadership Council (DLC), a Felix Rohatyn-allied private group in the Democratic Party, which *EIR* has shown to be financed by two of the same megabucks right-wing foundations which brought you the Conservative Revolution and the Clinton impeachment: the Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation and the Smith Richardson Foundation.

Lyndon LaRouche commented that they're hanging out their shingle, but they shouldn't be surprised if an undertaker answers their ad. After six years of this Administration, we don't need a new source of psychobabble. It proves once more: With our economic recovery legislation, the LaRouche Democrats and their allies are the only ones who are doing anything serious.

Indeed, Stan Greenberg (in [www.thedemocraticstrategist.org](http://www.thedemocraticstrategist.org)) shows a kindred awareness: After reviewing the contributions to his site, he says he is "not at all sanguine that Democrats will accept the challenges," pointing, in somewhat more polite language than this, to their record of total indifference to the plight of the lower 80% of income brackets. It's true. In fact, they don't give a damn about them; they're only

concerned about the campaign contributions of the upper 10%, especially the upper 2%.

## The Fraud of the Opposition's Arguments

Take Wednesday's Iraq debate, for example. One might ask, "How many more of your constituents, Senator, all from the lower 80% of income brackets, will be permanently maimed in Iraq, because of what you did Wednesday? Added to how many maimed already? And does that bother you? Not unduly, apparently."

Wednesday's Senate charade was closely related to all of this. Kerry had been placed under enormous pressure to back off his bill to withdraw from Iraq in a year; all kinds of maneuvers were made against him. He persisted. Finally, he was not permitted to speak until 6:00 p.m., to minimize press exposure.

The excuse for the pressure was that Kerry's amendment would hurt the party in the elections; that it's not what the American people want. But as Kerry's friends point out, that's ridiculous on its face. The one point which has people most angry against Bush is Iraq; everyone agrees that it's the factor which is most responsible for his abysmal poll ratings.

But that's not the point in any case, as Kerry has said: It's not the electoral consequences,—it's that this is a key policy question. It's a disastrous strategic situation; and the Carl Levin (D-Mich.)-Jack Reed (D-R.I.) "sense of the Senate" resolution, put forward to counter Kerry, was ridiculous on its face.

Kerry's approach followed along his stated intent in a much-publicized speech at Faneuil Hall on April 22: "Truth is the American bottom line. Truth above all is fundamental to who we are. It is no accident that among the first words of the first declaration of our national existence it is proclaimed: 'We hold these truths to be self-evident. . . .'"

But Democratic Senator after Democratic Senator, led by Joe Biden of Delaware,—who spoke knowledgeably and eloquently about Iraq, until he finally got to his point,—stood up on June 21, to tell the Senate that we must not "cut and run" in Iraq, and words to that effect. (Recall that Biden was originally an Averell Harriman protégé.) The ambitious Sen. Barack Obama of Illinois simply railed directly against Kerry without even the pretext of any higher motive or broader view.


Like nothing so much as a bunch of whores!

Furthermore, the issue is not really Iraq. As important as that is, the real issue was something still more important which subsumes it: The issue was leadership. Kerry, with the support of his allies, was actually providing leadership,—and for that, he was targeted to be brought down.

This, when we're at two minutes to midnight, and without clear, decisive leadership, Americans will be cut down like grass in the cataclysms triggered by the onrushing financial collapse.

Something else has to be going on, rather than simple electoral opportunism. What is it?

Look at the list of think-tanks ("don't-think" tanks?) ad-



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

*Sen. John Kerry is providing real leadership on Iraq, but his effort to pass a resolution for a July 2007 pullout was sabotaged by Democrats who have been comed into thinking that they can build a Democratic majority by imitating the psychobabble approach of the neo-conservative think-tanks, while abandoning the lower 80% of the population.*

vising the Democrats. There's not one brain among them,—it's a brainless group!

"Brainless" is the *best* way to characterize the actions of most Senate Democrats. Their whorishness will produce a strategic disaster, as well as a disaster for themselves in the elections, on top of it. The Senate Democrats are listening to a gaggle of think-tanks which are mostly infested by the DLC.

Indeed, the DLC sent out an e-mail on June 22, which endorsed and laid its own claim to *Democracy Journal*, disclosing that co-editor Cherny is former editor of the DLC magazine *Blueprint*,—and similarly endorsed and claimed *The Democratic Strategist*, describing its co-editor Ruy Teixeira as a "DLC alumnus."

Is it really that new Democratic think-tanks are springing up, or is it only that the DLC is metastasizing?

It's not the American people, nor an electoral calculation, which caused the fiasco of June 21. We're in a quagmire, and the Senate Democrats are acting brainless—stupid—in a way which can only lead to destruction. There is no intelligent explanation for what they're doing.