

## Editorial

### *Money Talks, News Media Lie*

The raft of reports about Democratic Presidential campaign fundraising that have appeared over the last days rival the Goebbels-style reporting on the war against Iraq, in their practice of blatant lying by omission. It is of crucial importance for the country, whether the Democratic Party will resume its role as a real opposition to the party of war and Wall Street, and force a change in current disastrous policies, or whether its candidates and Congressional leaders will buckle under to a state of "permanent war emergency" until the economy, the Presidency, and the nation are hopelessly lost. Thus is it critical that Lyndon LaRouche's leadership be recognized, against the "Big Lie" that continues to try to keep him out of Presidential debates and news coverage.

Blacked out of all "mainstream" reports of the Federal Election Commission campaign-money filings, is the fact that the LaRouche in 2004 Democratic Presidential campaign has raised a total of \$3,902,377, with \$821,000 of that in the first quarter of 2003. Lyndon LaRouche ranks fourth among the ten announced Democratic candidates in total campaign fundraising, exceeding six of the so-called major candidates: Sen. Joe Lieberman (\$3 million); Vermont Gov. Howard Dean (\$2.6 million), Florida Sen. Bob Graham, Ohio Rep. Dennis Kucinich, former Illinois Sen. Carol Moseley-Braun, and Al Sharpton. Here are the figures:

Candidate	1st Q	Total
Kerry	\$7,010,242	\$10,162,140
Edwards	7,418,568	7,418,568
Gephardt	5,951,721	5,951,721
LaRouche	821,776	3,902,377
Lieberman	3,013,842	3,013,842
Dean	2,639,209	2,944,360
Graham	1,119,161	1,119,161
Kucinich	180,060	180,060
Moseley-Braun	72,450	72,450
Sharpton	na	na

Taking the first quarter of 2003 alone, when all ten candidates were locked in a strenuous fundraising race,

LaRouche is still seventh of the ten. Between January and March, LaRouche out-raised so-called major candidates Rep. Dennis Kucinich, who reported \$180,060, and former Sen. Carol Moseley-Braun, who reported \$72,450 in contributions. Al Sharpton's report, due April 15 if he raised more than \$5,000, was not filed, but is expected to be less than LaRouche's first-quarter total.

LaRouche's fundraising includes no contributions from political action committees, or bundled contributions from law firms or any other firms.

Those analyzing the significance of the fundraising totals, should also note that both Sen. John Kerry (Mass.), who raised a total of \$7 million in the first quarter, and Rep. Dick Gephardt (Mo.), who announced raising \$5.9 million in the first quarter of 2003, have transferred millions of dollars left over from previous political campaigns, to their Presidential committees. Sen. John Edwards (N.C.) was the highest fundraiser, with \$7.4 million in contributions.

How then, can the major media justify their blackout of LaRouche's campaign, which receives major national support in spite of it? How can the Congressional Black Caucus, like other political or social formations, justify their attempt to omit LaRouche from their major Presidential debate? Is their fear of the media more important to them than the political process, the will of the voters, and the fate of the country itself?

LaRouche's campaign funds, as opposed to those of the "money" candidates, are being poured into immediate political activity, such as Washington, D.C. radio ads, pamphlets, and the deployment of his youth movement in political interventions. "There's more bang for your buck from giving to the LaRouche Presidential campaign," said one of his campaign spokesmen. "LaRouche has the largest active national campaign on the ground, and more staying power, because of his ideas, than the 'money' candidates."

Money talks: This kind of support for a true *opposition* candidate can't be faked or "spun up." Any Presidential election debate or news roundup from which LaRouche is blocked is a fraud, and a dangerous one.