

Gore disassociates

If the timing of Gore's campaign launch was bad, the delivery was even worse. Appearing on "20/20," Gore launched into a carefully rehearsed attack on President Clinton that immediately grabbed worldwide headlines. "Gore Attacks Clinton," the BBC World Service headlined its gloating coverage. "Gore's Running—Away From Bill," Rupert Murdoch's *New York Post* chortled.

"I've said previously, and I will repeat to you," Gore told ABC's Diane Sawyer, "I think what [Clinton] did was inexcusable. If you've ever had a friend who disappointed you and you worked with that person, and you rebuilt the relationship, and moved forward from the disappointment, that's exactly what that was like for me." Continuing in the same patronizing tones, Gore added, "I use the term 'inexcusable,' I use the word 'awful, terrible, horrible.' You know, the man was a friend of mine, and I am—we have a close working relationship and he had—he's gone through a lot in this. . . . I thought it was awful. I thought it was inexcusable. But I made a commitment to serve this country as vice president. I have a commitment to help him be the best President he's capable of being."

Gore also made it clear that his differences with President Clinton are over policy matters, as well as so-called "personal morality." Gore told Sawyer that he kept his political differences to himself, "because I took an oath under the Constitution to serve my country as vice president, which means . . . not arguing with the policies of the administration. But everything changes on Wednesday when I become a candidate, because I will be describing my vision for the future. If that happens to be different from what the administration wants, I think that's understandable to people."

The *Wall Street Journal*, one of the most vicious of the City of London-allied "Get Clinton" propaganda organs, not surprisingly, hailed Gore's break with the President. In a lead editorial, headlined "Gore's Chore," the *Journal* wrote, on June 17, "Vice President Gore formally joined the race for the White House yesterday, and we wish him luck, All the more so since he seems to be self-consciously struggling with the burden of separating himself from the boss he served so slavishly for seven years. . . . But if Mr. Gore now wants to critique the Clinton years, we welcome him."

Differences galore

Indeed, when the history of the Clinton Presidency is written, it will show that, almost every time that President Clinton launched an initiative that genuinely served the general welfare of the United States, whether in foreign policy or on domestic affairs, Vice President Gore not only opposed him, but fought, behind the scenes, to sabotage the President's efforts.

The most egregious instance of such Gore sabotage was his support on behalf of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, the so-called welfare

to work bill that President Clinton, tragically, signed into law—against his own better judgment, and against the advice of such senior advisers as Labor Secretary Robert Reich, White House Deputy Chief of Staff Harold Ickes, and Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin.

The bill, a cornerstone of the Gingrich revolution's "Con-

LaRouche to Clinton: Tell the truth about China Embassy bombing

Democratic Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche issued the following statement on June 14. On the same day, Deputy Secretary of State Thomas Pickering left for Beijing; his mission, as Secretary of State Madeleine Albright described it, was to ease the strain, and explain the "tragic accident," and urge that the U.S. and China "get beyond" this incident, because of the importance of relations between the two nations.

The proposal that the U.S. President do no more than "apologize" for the willful bombing of China's Belgrade Embassy, is the worst possible course of action the President could tolerate from his subordinates, such as Secretary Albright. The evidence is clear, that that bombing could not have occurred in any way but the [Global Positioning System] GPS targetting of a site which NATO knew to be the codes for the China Belgrade Embassy.

The world, including the U.S.A. government, knows that that bombing was intentional; to offer an apology which is based upon the lying assertion of "only a tragic accident," is the worst possible action at this time, almost a politically suicidal action, for the U.S. President's credibility among any of the world's nations.

Granted, the British monarchy's agents and stooges, which actually perpetrated that targetting, might try to assassinate President Clinton, and also me, if the President were to tell the truth publicly. The fact remains, that if the President goes along with Albright's proposed diplomatic lie, that would only make it easier for the British monarchy's instruments to repeat its assassinations of several Presidents, including Presidents Lincoln and McKinley, in the past.

For a change, the U.S.A. should try telling the truth, rather than telling non-offensive diplomatic lies for the pleasure of its traitors and other enemies.