

Sir Charles said that his job was even more intense, in an age of rapid communications, where President Bill Clinton talks so frequently with Sir Charles's boss, Prime Minister Blair. He boasted that he could put a dispatch on the Prime Minister's desk within one-half hour. However, he said that before Prime Minister Blair would make a phone call to President Clinton, there was usually a long questionnaire sent to the British Embassy, instructing the Embassy to find out precisely what the balance of forces on the policy issue at hand was in the U.S. government and throughout the United States.

Sir Charles also mentioned the influence-peddling that is carried out through the British Embassy and its consulates in the United States. He noted that since becoming Ambassador 18 months ago, he has given more than 50 speeches throughout the United States, and the Embassy has had more than 14,000 guests at dinners, teas, and receptions.

Sir Charles said that as Ambassador to the United States, he has had to be "part saloon keeper, part pundit, and part hotelier"; the last because of the huge volume of visitors to the United States from every walk of life in Britain. He stated that only by performing these services, has he been able to maintain the vast Anglophile "networking" essential to keep Britain first and foremost in Washington.

'Lying abroad'

Sir Charles said that his favorite description of an ambassador was that "he was an honest man sent to lie abroad."

While *EIR* has no proof that Sir Charles ever was an "honest man," he clearly does "lie abroad."

This author asked Sir Charles why Blair, British Defense Secretary George Robertson, and Foreign Secretary Robin Cook had come to the United States almost two days before any other government delegation to meet with President Clinton prior to the summit for NATO's 50th anniversary. This author asked whether the purpose had been to pressure President Clinton to agree to a ground war in Kosovo; and why, after President Clinton reportedly forcefully rejected this proposal, Blair had dodged two scheduled press conferences.

This question is important, given that Foreign Secretary Cook was set to arrive in the United States on May 19, "to stiffen the Clinton administration's resolve" for a ground war.

Sir Charles replied: "Well, that was a particularly harsh question from the media. I was at the three-hour meeting between President Clinton and the Prime Minister, and I can tell you that the Prime Minister never once raised the question of ground troops. As for why Prime Minister Blair came to the U.S. 36 hours early, he had a long-standing engagement in Chicago. And, I must say, the Prime Minister did not dodge the press."

When this author tried, in a follow-up question, to point out that Blair's speech in Chicago had called for the globalization of NATO in the same way that there was a globalization now of free trade economics, the microphone was taken from my hands.

Voters look to dump Gore, and the Democratic Party should listen

by Michele Steinberg

Democratic Party leader Lyndon LaRouche, who is running for the Year 2000 Presidential nomination against Al Gore and Bill Bradley, on April 2 issued a forceful statement warning Democrats that they will fail to regain the U.S. Congress, and fail to win the Presidency, if they continue to stick to the so-called "Gore legacy."

LaRouche said, "World economic depression is already under way. Worldwide war is already threatened. It is time for a change in the way things have been going. Don't just support a candidate. Support a change. The world, this nation, and you badly need that change."

"It is currently estimated among relevant Party circles, that the Democratic Party generally will tacitly recognize Gore's unelectability by this coming summer," continued LaRouche, anticipating that "some other Democratic candi-

dates will appear on the list."

LaRouche pointed out that "A crisis far worse than 1929-1932 is in progress inside the U.S.A. itself. . . . The world's needs cry out for a U.S. leader with the outlook and commitments of a Franklin Delano Roosevelt. U.S. candidates who are not committed to policies and outlooks like those of Roosevelt are of little use to the United States, or the world as a whole today. For the moment, I am the only visible candidate who meets that standard."

During two weeks in mid-May, LaRouche's forecast that Gore's liability as a candidate would be widely recognized within the Democratic Party by the summer, began to hit with gale force.

Gore continues to plummet in the frequent election polls. The latest poll on May 13 shows him losing to George W.

Bush by 56% to 40%. His staff is also reeling from a sudden, and unwelcome campaign change, with the appointment of former Rep. Tony Coelho (D-Calif.) to run the campaign.

The stench of Gore

Gore's lack of appeal to Americans isn't new; in 1988, he was a disaster in the Presidential primaries. In the New York primary, he came in third, with barely 10% of the vote, behind Michael Dukakis and Jesse Jackson; he also promised, as a "Southern Senator" from a civil rights "tradition," to carry the South, but that never happened. Jesse Jackson beat him there, too.

But at root, there is a much bigger problem for Gore: the American people smell a rat, and continue to insist, even in polls, that he "lacks leadership," "doesn't have a clear vision for America," and is "too stiff and wooden" to lead the country. What the American voters are sensing, increasingly, is that Gore is little more than a British puppet, like Henry Kissinger, and former President George Bush. Gore jumped at the chance to usurp the Presidency during the British-controlled impeachment of Clinton, and is responsible for the worst policy decisions of the entire Clinton Presidency.

From the summer of 1998, when Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr launched what he hoped was the "end-game phase" of his vendetta against Clinton, Gore began operating on indirect advice from Kissinger that he do what Kissinger had done during the Nixon impeachment—that is, covertly take over the government. From mid-August onward, Gore pushed the United States into a series of needless, anti-civilian military actions—in Sudan on Aug. 20, 1998; in Iraq at the end of December 1998; and in late March 1999 in Kosovo.

LaRouche told Democrats in his April 2 statement, that "current Vice President Al Gore, could never become President unless President Clinton resigned or were assassinated." Gore has gambled that the British Empire's continuing efforts to get rid of Clinton before the end of his term, would succeed, and Gore might become President. But Gore's trust in his "special relationship" with the British elite, could turn out to be one of the main reasons why he is finally pushed aside, as the Democratic Party opens up to serious debate, and seizes the opportunity to adopt a real Franklin Roosevelt-oriented policy.

Gore's two greatest official "achievements" as Vice President were the 1996 welfare cuts that threw thousands of America's poor onto the scrap-heap, and his "Reinventing Government" project, in which he fired close to 300,000 Federal employees.

Not a few sober-minded Democrats have concluded that Gore's "New Age" mumbo-jumbo will kill the party, and that he has no intention of enacting policies that will address the poverty and hard times that have hit blue-collar, minority, and farm families across the country. They have come to agree that Gore's "Third Way" is indeed 100% British, and doomed to failure.

Democrats speak out

In the April 1999 newsletter of the Philadelphia local of the American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE), labor editor Joe Ponisciak wrote an editorial, "Still Fat at the Top," directly attacking Gore's "reinventing government." Citing a study by Paul Light, Ponisciak writes, that Light "credits new labor President wannabe Vice-President Al Gore with making the 272,900 position reductions as the centerpiece of his reinventing government campaign. So do I."

Gore exposed how disconnected he is to the concerns of inner-city minorities on May 4, when he made a grandstand appearance at the Detroit chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), hosted by one of his minority endorsers, Mayor Dennis Archer, a Republican turned Democrat. Archer is so despised by his constituency that more than 120,000 "Recall Archer" petitions to drive him out of office (more than twice the number needed) had been delivered that very day. Archer is being recalled precisely for implementing warmed-over GOP austerity and "free trade" ideas. Not only is Archer implementing the anti-education privatized schools scheme of Michigan Gov. John Engler (a GOP front-runner for vice-president), but he has made legalized gambling and "black casinos" into the post-industrial economic foundation for Detroit.

A May 13 *Washington Post* story titled "Gore Worries House Democrats" reported that participants in the first meeting between the Gore campaign and Congressional Democrats, had complained that the Gore team is neglecting key Democratic constituencies such as unions, minorities, inner-city residents, and farmers. A few reportedly also complained that the danger of a protracted war like in Yugoslavia (a war which Gore and his Principals Committee pushed the President into), will detract from the party's ability to win in 2000.

More bluntly, the Conservative Revolution's *Washington Times* reported on May 13 that "there is growing concern, perhaps even fear, among many Democrats about Vice President Al Gore's weak polling numbers, especially in the northeastern states his party usually takes for granted. But instead of grouching in private about it, some Democrats are going public with their complaints, telling anyone who will listen that Mr. Gore turns off voters, even his own party.

" 'I'm concerned about the party's chances for the Presidency right now,' longtime Massachusetts Democratic campaign strategist Tubby Harrison said. 'I'm worried about what's happening on the Democratic side.' "

The *Washington Times* reported that "Mr. Gore's chief weakness, say veteran Democratic strategists, is . . . his stiff, insufferably boring personality.

" 'He does not come across as a real person,' says Mr. Harrison. 'Apart from his woodenness, it's his choice of words and phrases. He's ponderous. He's not natural. . . . He doesn't connect.' "

The liberal flagship *New York Times* on May 14 published a front-page story trumpeting the news "Clinton Admits Con-

**Former Mexican President
José López Portillo:**

**‘And it is now necessary
for the world to listen to
the wise words of
Lyndon LaRouche.’**



An EIR Video

The Eurasian Land-Bridge: Ally with China, Not London

EIR's hour-long video features speeches by Lyndon LaRouche and Helga Zepp-LaRouche, and by former Mexican President José López Portillo. Here, Mr. López Portillo is shown with Mrs. LaRouche (right) and Mexican political leader Marivilia Carrasco.

Order Today!

EIE-99-002 **\$25**

Call Toll-free **888-EIR-3258** (888-347-3258)

cern" about Gore's poor performance.

The polls released on May 13 were indeed deadly. A *USA Today*/CNN/Gallup poll showed that Texas Gov. George Bush would defeat Gore 56% to 40% if the election were held today. A *Boston Herald* poll shows Gore trailing Bush by 37% to 44% in Democratic stronghold Massachusetts—the state that gave Clinton his biggest victory in 1996. In New York, where Democrats outnumber Republicans two to one, Gore barely polls 50% against Bush.

Gore's solution of hiring Tony Coelho will probably just make things worse. Coelho, who left Congress under a cloud of allegations about shady dealings with a savings and loan bank, has been blamed for losing the Congress in 1994 to Newt Gingrich and the fascist Conservative Revolutionaries. Coelho's strategy was to be "more Republican" by preempting GOP issues. When, in January 1995, Sen. Edward Kennedy denounced this idea, saying this country "doesn't need two Republican Parties," Gore was clearly on the other side, allying with a GOP mole, "Dirty Dick" Morris, to pre-empt GOP issues, which lost them the Congress again in 1996. With Gore and Coelho, Democrats could expect to lose again in 2000. The only thing that Coelho does give Gore, is access to big money.

Deep policy differences

A story being circulated in Washington, is that Gore is "furious" at Clinton for having given an unauthorized interview about Gore's campaign to the *New York Times*. There certainly is a fissure, but it's much bigger than that.

Clinton has visibly broken with Gore's "Third Way" buddy, British Prime Minister Tony Blair, and with Her Majesty's Blair government, over the conduct of the Kosovo war. While President Clinton is working to reach a peace settlement that includes Russia and China, Gore's British friends are hell-bent on widening the war into a strategic confrontation between NATO and Russia. Blair is again demanding a green light for a ground invasion, and he wants the decision *within two weeks*. Clinton is resisting; other NATO leaders such as Germany's Chancellor Gerhard Schröder, have openly attacked the British for pushing a ground invasion.

Gore has been the British cabal's asset in the Kosovo war drive. Indeed, Gore's national security adviser Leon Fuerth, the leading Anglo-Zionist agent on the Principals Committee, says the Kosovo war *is* Gore's war. "To an unusual degree among Vice Presidents, he's shaped that policy," bragged Fuerth. "[Gore] is in the cockpit." Fuerth and Gore consider Clinton their *co-President*, and have been caught sabotaging his policies.

As *EIR* has reported previously, the Kosovo war was started by a direct Gore action *behind Clinton's back*. But, beginning with the NATO summit on April 23-25, Gore was excluded from strategic matters, as Clinton began to take back the Presidency that had been usurped during the British-controlled impeachment.