

giants. Waxman also objected to the effort by Cheney's legal counsel, who urged the General Accounting Office of the Congress on May 16, 2001, to scrap an inquiry Waxman had asked for, investigating the role of Federal employees in the Cheney Task Force's meetings, along with other corruption charges. However, despite a request from the GAO, the Vice President refused to turn over any documents from the Committee, and the GAO had to file a lawsuit for them.

In fact, the strategy that has been pursued, to this day, appears to be stonewalling by the Vice President's office, while other agencies involved in the Task Force—e.g., the Energy and Commerce Departments—deluge plaintiffs with documents. Like any cover-up, the scandal grows with efforts to suppress it, and on July 8, 2003, a Federal Appeals Court granted Judicial Watch the right to discovery of Cheney's Task Force documents, unless clear and present risk were posed by the release of documents, which must be specified. This court decision should significantly aid the lawsuit brought against Cheney's Energy Task Force by the GAO, which is also being stonewalled.

Returning to the three maps that have been released, it is significant that a fact sheet released on the U.A.E. indicates that Enron was a partner with Qatar and TotalFinaElf in an \$8 billion Dolphin Gas Project. And Enron, together with Occidental Petroleum, TotalFinaElf, ExxonMobil, Shell, and Conoco were listed on the Saudi map as involved in a "Red Sea Area" gas exploration of as yet unknown dimensions. Whether or not Enron had contact with Cheney's Energy Task Force has been a key question, because several top company executives have been indicted on charges stemming from the firm's "energy piracy."

Through the various lawsuits, it has come out that 39 top energy and related firms, between 1999-2002, gave \$6.3 million in direct, PAC, and "soft money" political contributions, of which \$4.5 went to Republicans. Many of these companies are known to have had contact with key members of Cheney's Energy Task Force, such as Secretary of Energy Spencer Abraham. Enron led the pack during these years, with a total of \$3,379,665, of which \$2,480,056 went to Republicans and \$899,109 to Democrats.

Other contributors involved in meetings with the Energy Task Force members include: Bechtel, which gave a total of \$645,640, of which \$469,690 went to Republicans and \$176,950 to Democrats; and, Halliburton, which had a total of \$480,188 in contributions, of which \$463,288 went to Republicans and \$15,900 to Democrats. While these contributions appear to be perfectly legal, it is likely—as the keys to the maps and subsequent developments contracts in Iraq with Bechtel and Halliburton show—that there was influence-peddling involved. In fact, the Vice President knows his deferred payments depend on performance. So, not only did he plan the invasion of Iraq when he was Defense Secretary, but through his Energy Task Force, he appears to have tried to calculate, to the penny, what war would bring for himself and his corporate cronies.

## LaRouche Campaign Is Outspending Rivals

by Anita Gallagher

Vice President Cheney will be unhappy to hear that Lyndon LaRouche's Presidential campaign is outspending all other candidates for President to date, LaRouche said, upon being informed of that feature of the July 2003 Quarterly campaign reports filed with the Federal Election Commission (FEC). LaRouche is continuing his aggressive spending to change the political situation and policies of the United States now, airing spots on Washington's most listened-to station (see box). He has been circulating nationally, through his LaRouche Youth Movement, since July 22, a new million-run campaign leaflet aimed at rapidly increasing the pressure on Vice President Dick Cheney to resign (see *Feature*).

Since announcing his campaign in January 2001, LaRouche has spent \$4.5 million in operating expenses, outpacing his nearest rivals: Sen. John Kerry (D-Mass.), who has spent \$4.1 million; and former Vermont Gov. Howard Dean (D-Vt.), \$3.8 million. LaRouche has also outspent President Bush's re-election campaign, Bush-Cheney '04, despite its \$35 million war-chest, by almost a 2-1 margin.

The new quarterly filings also showed that LaRouche remains among the leaders in *raising* campaign funds. Among the ten major candidates seeking the Democratic nomination. LaRouche ranks second in the cumulative number of individual contributions, and sixth in total money raised. LaRouche's total money raised during the campaign currently stands at \$4,564,654. Despite a coordinated press blackout—with the nation's major press claiming not to know LaRouche is a Democrat—his campaign monies raised are substantially larger than those of Sen. Bob Graham of Florida, Ohio Rep. Dennis Kucinich, former Illinois Sen. Carol Moseley-Braun, or Rev. Al Sharpton (see **Table 1**).

LaRouche's campaign sent shockwaves through the U.S. political establishment with the April 2003 Quarterly filings, which showed the "FDR Democrat" to be the *frontrunner* then in terms of parameters of mass support for his campaign, including individual contributions, as well as the total amount of money raised from individuals giving less than \$200. (The FEC defines an "individual contribution" as any transaction by an individual who has given \$200 or more in total.)

Now, after the results of the latest quarter, only Dean, who has been the beneficiary of Internet contributions both directly, and indirectly through the moveon.org online primary which excluded LaRouche, ranks higher in number of individual contributions, with 14,424 to LaRouche's 12,464. Both exceed Kerry and Sen. John Edwards of North Carolina,

TABLE 1

**Democratic Presidential Campaign Fundraising**

Candidate	Cumulative No. Individual Contributions*	Cumulative \$ Amount	Individual Contributions, July Q	\$ Amount, July Q
Dean	14,424	\$10,545,459.56	10,334	\$7,597,054.57
LaRouche	12,464	4,564,654.66	4,630	839,744.70
Kerry	11,622	16,028,267.92	5,365	5,815,109.57
Edwards	10,001	11,936,277.51	4,419	4,494,384.62
Lieberman	7,395	8,151,575.99	5,066	5,127,108.24
Gephardt	6,305	9,787,981.77	3,561	3,829,991.50
Graham	2,806	3,136,325.79	2,010	2,016,164.79
Kucinich	1,528	1,720,354.71	1,370	1,537,168.98
Sharpton	269	137,415.00	147	54,759.00
Moseley-Braun	235	217,108.85	164	144,658.24

Source: Federal Election Commission.

\* Individual contributions are transactions by individuals giving \$200 or more in total.

who have 11,622 and 10,001 individual contributions, respectively; and far surpass the other Democratic candidates, according to FEC figures.

**LaRouche's Campaign Strategy**

For LaRouche's rivals for the Democratic nomination, this is the period called "the invisible primary"—a time when conventional wisdom says to raise money, and sock it away to spend on vacuous activity in 2004. LaRouche took on the popular notion of Presidential campaigning—planning to spend money next year while doing nothing about the dangers of war, depression, and fascism now—when he announced his campaign for President in January 2001, and is now close to forcing a shakeup in the Bush Administration in 2003 by

TABLE 2

**Presidential Campaign Operating Expenditures**

Candidate	Cumulative Operating Expenditures	Cumulative Amount Raised
LaRouche	\$4.5 million	\$ 4,564,654.00
Kerry	4.1 million	16,028,267.92
Dean	3.8 million	10,545,459.56
Gephardt	3.4 million	9,787,981.77
Lieberman	2.7 million	8,151,575.99
Edwards	2.3 million	11,936,277.51
Graham	1.1 million	3,136,325.79
Kucinich	0.6 million	1,720,354.71
Moseley-Braun	0.2 million	217,108.85
Sharpton	0.1 million	137,415.00
Bush-Cheney '04	2.4 million	35,148,846.97

Source: Federal Election Commission.

getting Cheney out. In a July 8 campaign policy document, "Sedate That Accountant!" (see *EIR*, July 18), LaRouche noted that his Democratic rivals refuse to acknowledge the depression, let alone fight to change the basic policies that have caused it; he posed the question: "Therefore: When, and why, under such circumstances, should anyone throw his or her money away as financial contributions to any of the leading parties, or their presently approved lists of Presidential pre-candidates?"

The candidate insisted that "The economically useful function of a Presidential campaign is to propagate those changes in policy which contribute to reversing the economic-social trends of the recent three-odd decades, and putting our nation back on that track of net

physical growth which was bequeathed to us by President Franklin Roosevelt's recovery. This work must go further, to present those proposed great tasks which are, first and foremost, the visible requirements for the coming two generations on this planet. It means, most urgently, a vast expansion of productive employment in needed items of basic economic infrastructure, which are the most immediately accessible, relatively large-scale programs of upgrading of a burgeoning sea of unemployed. . . . It must include long-range mission-orientations toward developing the needed technologies of the future. In such ways, an appropriate Presidential or comparable election campaign makes the same kind of contribution to the general welfare of a nation's economy, as an important breakthrough, or a set of breakthroughs in technology."

In an article entitled, "Race for the White House Generates \$101 Million So Far," Charles Mahaleris of *Talon News* reported that the fundraising for the 1992 primary and general election for all candidates in both parties totalled \$331.1 million in campaign contributions. In 1996, \$425.7 million was raised by all candidates. In 2000, a total of \$528.9 million in contributions was raised by the Democratic, Republican, and Independent candidates for President. In the 2004 election, candidates had already raised \$101.1 million in contributions as of June 30, 2003—a full 16 months before the November 2004 election. As the other candidates cover for Cheney by attacking poor dumb President Bush for the faked intelligence on Iraq, LaRouche's warning in "Sedate That Accountant!" rings out: "Today, most of the money contributed to, and spent for the Republican and Democratic campaigns is a monstrous mass of economic waste, a vast expenditure which does far, far less than nothing of benefit to the economy as a whole. . . . My movement and I represent actual ideas for building the future. My campaign is already worth far more to every U.S. citizen than the dollar spent to conduct it. Could any rival campaign dare to claim as much?"