

---

## Campaign Watch

---

# Al Gore goes to pot

by Michele Steinberg

The international dope lobby is gleeful, after Vice President Al Gore broke with White House policy, and endorsed “medical marijuana”—the latest propaganda ploy by the drug legalization crowd—during a town meeting in Derry, New Hampshire on Dec. 14.

Gore said that when his sister was suffering from cancer, she had tried marijuana, prescribed by her doctor in Tennessee. “I think she should have had the ability to get her pain relieved that way,” he said. “We haven’t done enough” to allow doctors to lawfully dispense marijuana.

Gore’s policy apes that of George W. Bush, who in October embraced making marijuana legalization a “states’ rights” matter. Ironically, Gore’s earlier position, posted on the website of the National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws, was quite the opposite. Gore previously said that “this administration is absolutely opposed” to legalizing marijuana, which is “not harmless or beneficial . . . it is more carcinogenic than tobacco.”

Within an hour after the pro-dope statement, Gore was retracting his remarks at a news conference following the town meeting. He added qualifications on legalization, including, for example, “if the research shows” it could be useful, and under “limited circumstances,” and if “there is no alternative.”

There are two explanations for why Gore is taking a pro-legalization position: first, is George Soros, the multi-billionaire who has funnelled more than \$20 million into the medical marijuana legalization effort. Soros has been one of Gore’s big backers on Wall Street, and more than once Gore has leaned on foreign governments to stop their investigations of Soros’s illegal operations.

Second, is the philosophical underpinnings of Gore’s book, *Earth in the Balance*, where it is clear that he has little respect for the human mind, and humankind’s unique ability to reason. For example, referring to the *people* of Kenya, Egypt, and Nigeria, Gore wrote, “It is *truly frightening* to imagine the impact of doubling or tripling their numbers—not to mention the pitiful quality of life these extra scores of millions can expect.”

### George W. Bush and poverty in Texas

After months of snubbing voters at candidate’s debates in Iowa and New Hampshire, George Dubya’s performance against fellow Republicans at recent debates revealed why he

didn’t want to show: He’s shallow, brittle, and dumb. Dubya was so repetitive and stiff that he shocked observers, and appeared determined to pretend he was alone on the stage. The most obnoxious of the canned refrains was that he’s “chief executive of the second largest state in the U.S.A.” which “would be the 11th-largest economy in the world if it were a country.”

Since he made such a big issue about it, voters should look at the dismal “state of the State of Texas.”

According to reports in December 1999, Bush’s Texas has the highest rate of medically uninsured residents in the nation—24.5%. This figure climbed under the Bush regime, from 24.3% to its current record high—50% higher than the national average of 16.3%. What are the consequences? According to a study by the American College of Physicians-American Society of Internal Medicine, having no health insurance is “Enough To Make You Sick,” i.e., more uninsured people die prematurely, the Dec. 7 *Washington Post* reported.

But that is just the tip of the iceberg of the disaster that is Texas: The state ranks 49th for the number of children with health insurance; 47th in the maximum welfare payment (\$201 a month for a family of three); 47th in state spending on public health; and dead last in state spending per capita. And, in the 43 border counties that include the city of El Paso, living conditions are hideous, with rambling shanty-towns without sewers or electricity proliferating in what is broadly described as the U.S. side of NAFTA-land.

### Dick Morris worried about LaRouche

In his new book, *Vote.com*, former White House consultant “Dirty Dick” Morris explains that “big money lobbyists and the media are losing their influence, and the Internet is giving power back to the people.” The days of “sound-bite” electioneering with the same simple-minded message repeated over and over are gone.

“Interactivity” is the key, Morris says. “In this new world, candidates will actually have to let voters talk and will have to pay attention to what they say. The campaign that affords the most engaging interactivity and gives voters the best chance to be heard will be the most successful. . . . Responsiveness will be key.” He confesses that most candidates and media consultants don’t have “the depth” to handle such an intellectual exchange with the voters. Without naming names, Morris warns that whoever has such an ability is a real threat to the established political order.

What is being widely discussed among Washington political observers is that Lyndon LaRouche, the Democratic Party Presidential pre-candidate, has an unrivaled mastery of such Internet dialogue. On Dec. 8, the *New Federalist*, weekly newspaper of the LaRouche movement, reported that a high-level effort had been made to “illegally shut down” LaRouche’s campaign website. The effort had come just after LaRouche made Presidential campaign history by holding an Internet webcast that included a 2.5 hour live dialogue with 550 supporters in New York City.