

in the Taiwan Strait has not changed dramatically over the last two decades,” it states, “except in a few niche areas like China’s deployment of SRBMs.”

The report says that beyond 2005, China’s national priorities will remain “development of a modern military force capable of exerting military influence within the region, achieving deterrence against potential enemies, preserving independence of action in domestic and foreign affairs, protecting the nation’s economic resources and maritime areas, and defending the sovereignty of the nation’s territory.”

Al Gore’s image is increasingly tarnished

Contrary to claims in much of the American, and also European media, there is no guarantee that Vice President Al Gore is the “sure winner” of the nomination to be the Democratic Party Presidential candidate in the 2000 elections. A number of Democratic Party sources told *EIR*, that there is a raging debate in the upper echelons of the party, over whether to go ahead with the Gore nomination. A recent secret poll reportedly showed that, in a two-way race between Gore and Bush, Gore would lose the Hispanic vote by nearly a 9:1 margin; and large numbers of African-American voters would stay away from the polls. According to the sources, the fear beginning to dawn on some top Democrats, is that a Gore nomination could throw into doubt the Democratic Party’s retaking of the House of Representatives.

Typical for the “Gore is a shoo-in” line in the media, was an article published in the London *Daily Telegraph* on Feb. 25. Its author, the *Telegraph*’s Washington bureau chief Hugh Gurdon, proclaimed that, for the first time in U.S. history, the outcome of the two major party nominations is known nearly two years before the Presidential elections. Texas Gov. George W. Bush is allegedly also a shoo-in for the Republican Party nomination, Gurdon wrote, because he has the endorsement of 31 Republican governors and a majority of Republican state legislators; he has his father’s money machine; and he has 27 current and former Republican members of Congress backing him.

The *Telegraph* newspapers, owned by Conrad Black, are flagship publications of the British-American-Commonwealth (BAC) grouping, which would like to see U.S. voters stuck with a choice between Bush and Gore. But reality is quite different, as even some press coverage is beginning to show.

The *National Review* of March 8 ran a cover story entitled “Apocalypse Gore: The Dark Vision of the Vice President,” which exposed Gore as a fanatical environmentalist and follower of existentialist philosopher and Nazi, Martin Heidegger.

The article, written by Adam Wolfson, focusses on Gore’s 1992 book *Earth in the Balance* to answer the question, “Who exactly is Gore, and what does he stand for?” Wolfson denounces Gore’s book for its incompetent bias against science and technology, and places him in the post-modernist tradition: “None of this invective against modernity . . . is especially original to Gore (although we should take him at his word that he wrote *Earth in the Balance* himself). Such postmodern critiques of our civilization took the academy by a storm decades ago, inspired by the philosopher Heidegger. That’s old news,” Wolfson writes. “What’s new is that a possible — even a probable — future President is aping these same arguments.”

Wolfson drives the point home, what a danger this constitutes for the nation: “When a tenured radical rails against the modern world, the principal harm is that his students will be cheated out of an education. But when our Vice President, and would-be President, puts forth these same arguments, one’s heart ought to skip a beat.”

While the American people are seeking answers to real issues, related to the economy, the notorious Dick Morris, who has put himself forward as Gore’s campaign adviser, has begun to agitate for Gore to pursue his environmentalist agenda, as the centerpiece of his campaign. Writing in the Washington publication *The Hill*, Morris (the “triangulator” and toe-sucker) urges Gore to “make environment the key issue for 2000,” not just dirty air, but “the new environmentalism” (see *Dossier*, elsewhere in this issue).

In addition to Gore, a couple of his campaign companions are also receiving rather unflattering press commentary. In its March 8 issue, the *Weekly Standard* of Rupert Murdoch ran a profile of Democratic Party fundraiser Nathan Landow, identified as a Gore man, not close to Clinton. Landow, who was Gore’s campaign finance chairman back in the 1988 campaign, is reportedly about to be indicted by independent counsel Kenneth Starr for witness-tampering and obstruction of justice, in the Kathleen Willey case. The article reviews several accounts in the public realm, of the connections of Landow to organized crime, in the 1970s and 1980s.

The LaRouche factor

To sum up the state of affairs Gore finds himself in, having surrounded himself with such “advisers,” the daily *Washington Times* carried a short article in its “Inside the Beltway” column on March 2, which testifies to the impact which Lyndon LaRouche and his supporters have had in exposing these and other connections of Gore. Entitled “Bad Boys,” it read: “Apparently Dick Morris is rubbing off on Al Gore. Political maverick Lyndon LaRouche says one reason he’s running for President in 2000 is to stop the ‘Dick Morris/Al Gore faction’ from turning the Democratic Party into a ‘second Republican Party.’ Mr. LaRouche, who in his 1996 Presidential campaign ran in 26 state Democratic Party primaries and garnered almost 600,000 votes, says Mr. Gore’s vision for the country is ‘infected with evil.’ ”