

Why expose Gore's record now?

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

December 9, 1998

He is as dumb and poisonous as a Gila Monster, as slimy-tailed and mean-spirited as a 'possum, as greedy as a backwoods loan-shark; he is an Armand Hammer protégé, with connections, disloyalties, and morals to match. You know how that good old Tennessee boy can get, when he doesn't get his way! There are some who might suggest, that if some relevant Baptist minister had held young Al Gore, Jr. under for just another three minutes, the baptism might have succeeded in making a Christian of even that "New Age" heathen fanatic. Our bi-polar Vice-President has a record as long as your arm. The question which will be asked of me, is, why did I wait so long to speak publicly of the matter in these terms?

In life in general, especially in history-making matters of state, there are some true facts, like your cousin Butch's smelly feet, Mathilda's insufferably bad breath, or Al Gore's ethics, which we avoid mentioning, unless absolutely necessary. But, then, if there comes a time when the survival of nations, even of civilizations, demands it, the unpleasant truths must be told, plainly, in timely fashion, with pungency and force.

How will you react, for example, to the curious coincidence, that one of my own and President Clinton's loudest enemies, Conrad Black's Hollinger Corporation, has said pretty much the same thing about Gore, in the Nov. 1, 1998 edition of its flagship publication, the London *Daily Telegraph*? How will you react to learning the additional, hard evidence, which the *Telegraph* did not report, which shows, that Vice-President Al Gore has deep, long-standing, close connections to a wide assortment of some of the most savage among President Bill Clinton's most impassioned, and nastiest, Zionist far-right-wing and other political and personal enemies, the recently retired Newt Gingrich and Conrad

Black notably included. Ask yourself: Why would my own and Clinton's perfervid enemies at the London *Telegraph*, ruin their otherwise nearly perfect publishing record, by, for once, telling the insider's truth about anyone, even Gore?

The time to speak out, came on the day, in Kuala Lumpur, when Vice-President Gore made an ass of the United States government, before the entire world. Admittedly, with his infantile Bozo-the-Clown act at that recent APEC meeting, he created a scandal which has ruined forever his chances of becoming President of the United States; but, that is only the surface of the crucial national-security problem he created by his behavior.

The gut of the Gore issue, is that this is no ordinary strategic crisis. By acting as he has done, repeatedly, in the worsening world crisis which erupted this Autumn, in the midst of the most awesome, global financial and monetary crisis in modern history, Gore's foolish actions, like the treachery of the Confederacy's Jefferson Davis, crossed the bloody line. He went beyond his usual, childish foolishness, and crossed that line, which defines where U.S. national-security ends, and intolerable conduct begins.

In the present world crisis, in face of the terrible crisis to hit during the coming eight weeks, U.S. national security demands that very plain words be spoken, without the usual double-talking, boardroom etiquette. The man whom the very-well-informed *Telegraph* reporter aptly described as "President-in-Impatient-Waiting" Gore, has crossed the line. After what he has done, even those who have otherwise tended to be sympathetic to him, or, at least tolerant, at the *Telegraph*, the *New York Times*, and elsewhere, have written Gore off publicly as a man who crossed a line, the type of defective personality which could never be allowed to become President.

As a result, President Clinton's ability to deal with the multiple threats, both to his Presidency and to the nation,



Vice President Gore and President Clinton at a 1995 press conference to announce "Project XL," to reform the environmental regulatory system. "You know how I get, when I don't get my way," one can almost hear Gore, the corn-ball Napoleon, muttering.

depends upon his acting now to put his Vice-President under apparent foreign-policy wraps, for the duration of the presently onrushing global financial crisis. I shall, first, sum up the nature of the crisis which prompts me to present this report on what is fairly labelled "The Gore Problem." After that, I shall summarize the broader strategic issues of foreign policy involved. In conclusion, I shall summarize the Gore problem as such.

1. The breaking world crisis

During the coming eight weeks or so immediately ahead, most of the world, including the U.S.A., will have been plunged into a deep economic depression, far deeper, far more menacing than what the U.S.A. experienced under President Herbert Hoover. There is no guesswork in that forecast; the present figures, showing that that is what is now about to strike, are easily accessed, and correspond precisely to the warning I first presented, in the form of my now well-known "Triple Curve," in the closing weeks of 1995. [See **Figure 1** in our *Feature*—ed.]

That "Triple Curve" was presented to illustrate the crux of my long-range economic forecast issued in mid-1994: to show how and why the world economy was then approaching entry into the terminal phase of that long spiral of financial collapse which had been set into motion, initially, by the August 1971 launching of the now-doomed "floating exchange-rate" monetary system, the present IMF system.

During the Summer of 1997, I announced that we must expect the world to actually enter that terminal phase of the world financial crisis not later than mid-October of that year. It happened exactly as I warned it would. Now, the crucial

financial, monetary, and hard-commodity-trade figures, for the period April 1998 to the present date, show, that the world's financial system, in its present form, will reach an end-point, of either a drop into a world depression, or a hyper-inflationary blow-out, during as early as the eight or so weeks ahead.

There is nothing miraculous about my ability to forecast with such degrees of precision. The world's financial and economic situation has recently entered a boundary-layer, somewhat like reaching supersonic speed. Look at three sets of figures which demonstrate that fact most simply. First, look at the lunatic rates of growth of U.S. M1, M2, and M3 over the past twelve months. Second, look at the rates of collapse in hard-commodity trade among nations during the same period. Third, see the causal connection among both those two sets of figures. Compare that with the temporary, wholly artificial growth in leading financial indicators. What these three sets of figures tell anyone who is not a complete dunce in the ABCs of economic facts, is that the system is now in the process of "going off all charts."

Since early October 1998, the G-7 central-banking systems have been virtually printing money (for example, U.S. M2) at rates of acceleration which must be compared with the final phase of Weimar Germany's hyperinflationary blow-out, during Summer 1923. This lunatic action by the G-7 central bankers, has been accompanied by the outbreak, during recent weeks, of the wildest, international, desperation-driven merger-mania in modern history; this has also been accompanied by the steepest rates of collapse of key sectors of hard-commodity production and world trade, and of raw materials prices, in post-war history.

All of this means, that the so-called “Keynesian alternative,” as proposed by international “Third Way” freaks such as Britain’s Prime Minister Tony Blair, is finished, as of about now. The critical “triple relationship”—the combination of up-zooming monetary expansion, hyperinflationary financial speculation, and down-zooming rates of collapse of hard-commodity production and trade—has now been reached, at which any further attempt to “save the system” by monetarist pump-priming methods, will now cause a virtually immediate blow-out of the very system which the “born-again Keynesian” clowns, such as Britain’s Tony Blair, propose to bail out. We have now, already entered the boundary layer which defines the end of the world financial system as we have known it since August 1971.

So, there are now only three options from which to choose. No matter which option you choose, what will erupt in the world economy beginning the coming period of approximately eight weeks, will be a shattering break-down of the world’s financial system in its present form. The first option, is a straight-forward chain-reaction collapse, bringing on a much steeper, and deeper depression than that during the early 1930s. The second option, the very temporary alternative, is a slightly later “Keynesian blow-out” of a Weimar-hyperinflation-style financial bubble. The third option, is my specifications for the emergency implementation of drastic and sudden measures, which I have named as a “New Bretton Woods System.” The latter measures include a sudden return to capital controls, exchange controls, approximately fixed parities of currencies, and measures of protectionism and financial regulation, echoing the pre-1958 period of the old Bretton Woods system. There now exist no other alternatives than these three.

Therefore, that third option is the only policy which corresponds with the vital foreign policy and other national security interests of the United States. This means scrapping the programs inherited from the “New Age” freaks of the old Gore-Gingrich Congressional Clearinghouse on the Future. It means scrapping “free trade.” It means scrapping “globalization.” In brief, Gore’s fanatically stubborn policies and the U.S. nation can no longer co-exist, as practice, on the same planet.

Otherwise, the alternative to that third, non-Gore option, is the “dog’s dinner” recently referenced by U.S. Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin. Then, the weeks ahead are times to say, “Boys, the party is over. You better call it a day and go home, if you still have a place you could call home.”

That is what I mean by issues of “national security.” Without a national and international political-economic arrangement which replaces the present, hopelessly bankrupt present international financial and monetary system, there will be no future U.S.A. much beyond the end the present century.

2. Two views of U.S. foreign policy

My duty here, is to identify, and defend two rather different, but overlapping views of the foreign-policy side of U.S.

national security. The first, is the view of foreign policy implicit in our good-hearted, but often temporizing President Bill Clinton’s not always successful foreign-policy efforts. The second, is my own view, which substantially coincides with the thrust of President Clinton’s often frustrated, and often bungled intentions, but which, on the other hand, also features my unique expertise in areas, notably economics, in which the President has shown essentially no competence. For our purposes here, it is essential that both the coincidence, and distinction between those two views be made clear.

Apart from his now loudly proclaimed, official standing as our republic’s First Sinner, President Clinton, with all his tendency for shilly-shallying, and other personal shortcomings, has been a decent man with decent personal political impulses on a large range of issues. We have had worse Presidents, often much worse. On the good side, from early in his administration, the central thrust of President Clinton’s foreign policy has pivoted on three nations: Germany, Russia, and China. A certain streak of his inclination for personal decency, in contrast to Gore’s blinkered ambitions, has been crucial in shaping the President’s expressed policy-orientations in these and kindred areas of policy.

The President had rightly chosen Germany as the desired U.S. partner of choice in spearheading improved economic relations among the U.S.A., continental western Europe generally, and Russia. That view of the natural, three-way economic partnership among the U.S.A., Germany, and Russia, echoes what had been the policy of all the greatest statesmen of Germany and Russia, and of the pre-McKinley-assassination U.S.A., since the global strategic diplomacy of Benjamin Franklin and John Quincy Adams. If the President has had reason to be disappointed with the net performance of his dinner partner, the now-former German Chancellor Helmut Kohl, Kohl’s relevant short-coming was that he was acting often as the victim of the murderous evil which the Thatcher-Mitterrand-Bush-Gorbachev gang shoved upon both Germany and Russia, during 1989-1992, before Clinton came on watch.

The President has been committed to the economic recovery of Russia, a commitment unfortunately colored in performance by the President’s ignorance of the ABCs of economics. His Russia policy has been a record of good intentions almost fatally blemished by the President’s blindness to the effects of Gore’s pro-mafia policies and connections; Gore’s influence is the chief single cause for the catastrophic failures of Clinton administration Russia policy during the past five years since the September 1993 shoot-out at the Russian parliament.

The President’s relations with the government of China have been, on balance, the one area in which Clinton has so far achieved great, if only qualified personal success. This will continue, if deference to the disastrous meddling of Al Gore and Gore-controlled political advisors does not ruin China policy, as it ruined Clinton’s Russia policy. Today, the success of the U.S. President’s strategic cooperation with China, is

the cornerstone of any viable U.S. foreign policy. It is also the last chance to salvage some durable net good, at last, from the two terms to which President Clinton has been elected.

The possibility of success in any other areas of the world depends on U.S. success in its dealings with the cornerstone partners Germany, Russia, and China. That does not mean policies based exclusively on these three partners alone; it means the building of the broader economic-policy partnership which depends upon bringing together these three as the seed-crystal of a planet-wide, new system of economic cooperation. India is a major partner for both Russia and China, and Japan for Russia, China, and Southeast Asia, for example. The survival of Germany and Russia, and, indeed, all of Clinton's foreign-policy options, now depend absolutely on the pivotal success of Clinton's crucial partner, China.

Admittedly, President Clinton has shown no understanding of any of the essentials of the relevant economic policies, in these or other areas of foreign policy. Nonetheless, his thrust toward finding a fruitful relationship with a group of nations associated with these three, and other nations, is correct, and corresponds to the most vital national-security interests of the U.S.A.: our nation's most urgent, life-or-death foreign-policy interests. In fact, unless those interests are defended, the United States itself will not exist as a viable economy and nation much beyond the end of this closing century.

By intention, there is no reason to doubt that President Clinton intends to serve such interests. Serving interests, however, is like fighting war; it is necessary to command both those competencies which are indispensable for victory, and the will to act accordingly.

Our nation's and your family's personal lives depend, unconditionally, upon your rallying, as a citizen should, to the defense of those foreign-policy interests.

Thus, on this point, and in this way, his foreign-policy efforts, and his continued role as President, must be supported unconditionally by all U.S. patriots. Neither Democratic Leadership Council Dr. Jekylls nor Republican Mr. Hydes must be allowed to put our nation into jeopardy with any more treasonous, anti-constitutional, British-parliamentary-style tricks, of the sort spewing out of the mouth of the world's worst pornographer and sleaze-ball in general, Kenneth Starr.¹

That much said, if we relied upon President Clinton's policy-making alone, the United States would not survive much beyond the close of this present century. Either we add to his efforts, exactly those policies which I have specified, or the U.S. will not survive many years to come — as a nation. This brings us to the second view of U.S. foreign-policy interests, my view of the same matters. This is a view of those interests on which even the mere survival of the U.S.A. now depends absolutely.

1. It should be suggested, that those deviant Democrats and lynch-mob Republicans debating which way to skin the President, might join together to create a crooked law-firm, to be known as Heckel, Jekyll, and Hyde.

3. The crucial policy-issues

The axiomatic foreign-policy interest of the United States, is to defend what President Abraham Lincoln once described as that form of government “of the people, by the people, and for the people,” established by our Leibnizian 1776 Declaration of Independence and 1789 Preamble of our Federal Constitution, a form of government, then unique on this planet, for which so many Americans gave their lives in the great struggle for freedom conducted under his command. It is important to stress, that on this account Lincoln was a knowledgeable follower of the greatest architects of the foreign policy of the United States, Benjamin Franklin and our greatest Secretary of State and one of our greatest Presidents, John Quincy Adams.

As I have avowed repeatedly, these United States are the great exception among all modern nations. This nation was the creation of the best minds of all European civilization, built here by Europeans, at a time when oligarchical rule over Europe could not be broken within Europe itself. Never, to this date, with the near exception of President Charles de Gaulle's Fifth Republic in France, has any state in Europe achieved a true republic. Only poor parliamentary approximations of a republic have been achieved there, to the present day. The combined former power of Europe's landed aristocracy, as under Metternich, and vast financier-oligarchical power, as of London, has made concessions to demands for democracy, but a true republic has yet to be achieved there.

Wise U.S. patriots have never scorned Europe on this account. We know that it was the best ideas of Europe, on which all the good achievements of the U.S. were built. Rather than scorn Europe for its failure to free itself from the grip of financier-oligarchical overlordship, we support Europe's efforts to achieve a more perfect freedom. We consider the right of all peoples to their own perfectly sovereign form of nation-state, as not only their moral right; we also recognize that it is our vital interest that all nations achieve that right in full. The informed foreign policy of the U.S. is to build a world based upon the principle of the modern perfectly sovereign nation-state, and upon the principle of mutually advantageous cooperation among such states.

The notion of rights which has informed all of the greatest statesmen of our republic, is premised on a specific view of the nature of each man and woman as made in the image of the Creator, as a creature set absolutely apart from, and above all others, and so distinguished by that power of reason, by means of which valid discoveries of physical principle and other notions of a similar quality of truthfulness, are generated within the appropriately educated mind of the individual person. The growth of the population and improvement of the material and demographic conditions of life of nations and their individual members, attests to the superiority of the form of modern European civilization which emerged from the Fifteenth-Century Renaissance, over all of those oligarchical forms of ancient and feudal society earlier. It is upon the perception of this progress in the condition of life of the individual member of society, that the notions of natural law and

foreign policy of our republic are rightly defined.

Simple pure democracy among pigs or 'possums, would never transform them into human beings. It is the increase of the per capita power of the human individual mind over nature, which expresses the distinction of man from beast, and the moral distinction between moral human beings, and beast-like predators such as George Soros.

In these considerations lie both the coincidence and the difference between President Clinton's political practice and my own. The President often shows himself a good-hearted person, but has not yet succeeded in honing his impulses into the form our domestic and foreign affairs require. Compassion for the human individual is an absolute requirement of a President, law-maker, or judge; but, the compassion must be efficiently expressed. It can not be efficiently expressed under conditions shaped by policies such as "post-industrial" utopianism, "free trade," and "globalization." The state is responsible for generating and maintaining policies and conditions under which morally required results are actually made available to each nation, and to each person, as the Preamble of our Federal Constitution was intended to be read.

There, the President and I have often agreed; there we have sometimes differed. We have often agreed in spirit; we have often differed respecting the means actually required to meet effectively the domestic and foreign-policy requirements of our government. If he could bring himself to adopt the appropriate economic policies, I believe the differences would wane.

The United States' government has it within its present reach, to catalyze the bringing into being of a new world order among many perfectly sovereign nation-states. The monstrous failure of the post-1971 world monetary order, forces us to consider sweeping changes, changes expressed as new forms of economic cooperation among sovereign nations. We are challenged to establish now, the post-colonial order which President Franklin Roosevelt had intended to bring into being at the close of World War II. The principal means for doing this now, are given to us by those nations which were abandoned to second-class status by the death of President Franklin Roosevelt; these latter include the leading "outsider" nations of the present world financial system, in particular, of Central and South America, Africa, and Eurasia. Cooperation among the U.S.A., Russia, China, India, and others, could very well provide the seed-crystal of the needed just new order of economic relations among perfectly sovereign nation-states.

If these our United States evade that great opportunity now, we shall almost certainly be sent to spend some pedagogical years in Hell, until we have learned to respond in better fashion to what are plainly the Creator's present, and impatient intentions.

4. Gore in himself

Turn now to the Kantian problem, the subject of Al Gore-in-himself.

Given the implications of what I must now say, it is I, not

my collaborators, who must assume personal responsibility, as I do here, for publicizing the national security and related strategic implications of the truth about Al Gore.

A few curious inconsistencies in Gore's behavior and connections must now be examined and cleared up. Tearing away the fraudulent "Mr. Clean" hoax which had been spread by earlier editions of the mass media, reveals an Al "thick and dumb" Gore better described as among the currently more notable sleaze-balls of the past quarter-century. That is just the beginning; it becomes much worse.

Begin with a brief look at one of the many, dog-like carpet-soiling travesties on Gore's record.

With the Nov. 1, 1998 *Telegraph* clipping in hand, let us now travel to Moscow, Russia, where Al Gore's personal connections to Soviet officialdom were established, no later than 1988, by the same Armand Hammer who launched Al Gore's political career, and had also helped promote the rise to power of two Soviet General Secretaries, Yuri Andropov and Mikhail Gorbachev.

In today's post-Thatcher-Bush Russia, there are two leading U.S.-based, sleaze-ball connections. One is to George Bush's International Republican Institute, which launched and maintained the political power of the so-called "Russian Mafia." The other U.S. connection to that same Mafia, is the perennial greed-ball, Vice-President Al Gore. Why, then, is the *Telegraph*, a known backer of the much-rumored year 2000 Bush Presidential campaign, attacking Bush's nominal mafia rival Al Gore? The facts are not quite so simple as popular opinion might wish.

In fact, the chances of Texas Gov. George W. Bush's winning the year 2000 U.S. Presidential nomination have depended, until now, upon guarantees that Al Gore, with support from the deviant Democrats' Democratic Leadership Council, will win the Democratic nomination. Any non-Gore Democratic campaign based on reviving the FDR tradition, could win a year 2000 election against 1932-Hoover-lookalike Bush. In other words, Gingrich's Republican cronies had been boosting Gore (while savaging President Clinton) in order to sink Gore, too, in the end.

However, in Russia, where a very poor quality of political intelligence, and some post-Soviet ideological blindness, on the actual dynamics of the internal U.S. situation, dominate most leading circles, the Gore connections are spreading the fairy tale, that the only way Bush can be defeated, is that Gore wins sufficient political support, from Russia and elsewhere, for a Gore victory in the year 2000 U.S. elections. In fact, a Gore victory in the Democratic primaries, is the one thing which might have virtually ensured a Bush victory in the year 2000 general election, just as the shambles of the 1988 Democratic Party's campaign locked in Bush's election as President! Worse, if international policy-making, right now, were to be based on the delusion that the only relevant choices are between a Bush and Gore victory for 2000, you might as well write off most of the human race for the foreseeable future.

Read the November 1, 1998 *Telegraph* article on Gore as a sign of what the Bush supporters' press campaign against Gore would come to look like—if Gore's candidacy is not scrapped. Either way—Gore actually nominated as a rival for Bush, or Gore chased out like a yelping whipped hound before the convention—Bush supporters shovelling tons of scandals into the international mass media, will make a globalized laughing-stock of Gore's fraudulent claims of being the "Mr. Clean" of U.S. politics. Come 2000, there would not be a backwoods in Tennessee remote enough for Al Gore to hide from relentless ridicule, as the exposed "political sleaze-ball of the century." For these, and other reasons, "Gore for 2000" is a born loser—and, you know how that Tennessee boy can get, if he doesn't get his way.

Admittedly, apart from his bi-polar outbursts of rage, and the sleaze, Gore, politically, is essentially a nothing; but, so is a gaping hole in the bottom of a boat. The problem is, to make that fact clear now, while the potential damage of his candidacy can still be corrected.

The issue is not the fact that Gore's policies are usually bad ones. Al Gore has had bad policies longer than he has been a candidate for political office. The fact that he has, or has had bad policies, is not the reason I raise the Al Gore problem as I have done here. Nor am I proposing to impeach him. Many politicians have bad policies, but often, with help of facts and reason, we are able to change their opinions. Not so with Gore: I am simply insisting that, from this point onward, Gore should assume none other than his strictly defined constitutional duties as Vice-President, and should not be considered a virtual "co-President," nor a serious candidate for election as President. Let him, in the course of time, retire quietly to enjoy his favorite indoor sport: counting his money. That is not really a drastic, or unfair proposal, all facts considered.

The problem I address here, is not merely that Al Gore has just burned the bridges to his Presidential aspirations behind him. The issue is the way in which he has burned his bridges; the issue is what that bridge-burning tells us about the character of the man. His disgusting display of bi-polar infantilism in his behavior at the Kuala Lumpur APEC meeting, is only the most visibly dramatic of a number of actions which requires that he be left out of the shaping of economic, social, and foreign policy from here on out.

The immediate issue is not that Gore has bad policies in most areas; that has always been a problem with him. The immediate issue is, that he has dug in his heels in such a way, that he has demonstrated his intent to wreck any Clinton policy which does not please the bi-polar Mr. Al Gore. It is not his bad policies which are the immediate issue; our government is filled with elected and other officials who have bad policies. The issue is, to coin a phrase, that he is the dog who has made up his mind to refuse to be house-broken any longer; therefore, he should be kept off the living room carpet. Under stress, Gore has reverted to type. He has become the old boy who warns you, "You know how I get, when I don't get my way."

As we have seen over the course of the recent years, as soon as Gore sniffs power in his reach, he drops his "Uriah Heep" act, and grabs for power for the sake of power, power for its own sake. He reacts with rage—the pure and simple bi-polar rage of a corn-ball Napoleon—against whom-ever he sees as "getting in his way." See his connections to super-grifter George Soros, for example; see his unmasked lunatic rage displayed against the enemy of his crony Soros, Prime Minister Mahathir, at Kuala Lumpur. That is only the best known of numerous examples of Gore's corn-ball Napoleon style. That brutish sort of mind-set must never be allowed to occupy the position of our republic's Commander in Chief.

Gore himself underscored another reason that he is clearly mentally and morally unfit to play the part of U.S. President, or virtual "co-President." In his lunatic rant against the Prime Minister Mahathir who had insulted Gore's crony Soros, Gore presented his own mentally and morally twisted definition of "democracy," as "billions" of gambling transactions placed daily on the electronic croupier-tables of the world's financial gambling establishment! Gore's moral arithmetic should remind any literate person of the perversity of those Confederate slave-owners who employed John Locke's defense of slavery, in the name of an allegedly democratic natural right to own one's property.

Gore shows thus the same type of mind as that of the Soros who used part of his own ill-gotten gains to promote legalized drug-trafficking, or those Dutch, who in the footsteps of the Nazis, argue in defense of the legalized "involuntarily assisted suicide" being practiced on a mass scale in the Netherlands today. Al "Thrasymachus" Gore showed himself so, once more, of that twisted, profoundly immoral twist of mind which threatens his victim self-righteously, "You know how I get, when I don't get my way."

This combination of Gore's lunatic rages, and sheer moral perversity, and the disastrous effects of those policies he supports during those explosive rage-fits, are an intolerable security-risk for this nation. This very bad chemistry, of lunatic passion and wild-eyed policy-obsessions, require that "the Gore Problem" be now generally recognized for what it is. The national-security interests of the U.S. require nothing less.

The onrushing disintegration of the world's financial system, makes certain immediate, drastic changes in U.S. foreign and economic policies an absolute imperative. All of those changes which must be made, more or less immediately, are changes which the crowd of "advisors" around Gore will never tolerate. This issue is a life-or-death question for our nation. Given Gore's manifest disposition for fits of impassioned, bi-polar irrationality, the most vital national-security interests of the nation demand that he be relieved of the means to continue to sabotage and obstruct those policy deliberations which must now be ongoing among our nation's political leadership.

Nothing special need be done. It is sufficient to have a clear understanding of the problem this represents, and to act calmly, but firmly, accordingly.