

the postwar period we have been like a little rich kid in the middle of a slum with a cake. . . . But what we have to share with a hungry world is not our cake, but the recipe we use to bake that cake. That recipe is private property, free enterprise, and individual freedom! And in a Gramm administration we will keep the cake and share the recipe."

During that same week, Gingrich and his fellow privateers in the House churned out subcommittee recommendations to slash \$17 billion from programs to help the nation's poor. The carnage included the proposed elimination of the federally funded school-lunch program (which provides many poor children with their only meal of the day), and turning it over to the states under block grants with no strings attached. Those grants would be pegged, for the next five years, at funding levels of less than *half* the rate of increase authorized during 1989-94. Low-income housing funds would also be cut by \$7.2 billion; another \$1.3 billion would be slashed by terminating summer youth programs already authorized for 1995 and 1996.

The Conservative Revolution's slave-labor program, being marked up in the name of "welfare reform" in the House Ways and Means Committee, was also revised to require the states to move 50% of their welfare caseloads (up from 20%) into "work or related programs" by the year 2003. Gingrich continued his own surfing along the Third Wave, publicly revealing a scheme to chop unemployment benefits and workmen's compensation, in favor of "retraining" for low-wage jobs.

The glassy-eyed worshippers of the "Contract on America" have settled into so many seats in the House, that they may still be able to pass substantial excretions of their stinking agenda. But the Senate fight over the Balanced Budget Amendment put the entire scheme under much closer scrutiny, and clearly undercut the prospects of Senate concurrence with whatever the House might attempt to force into law. The American people also saw much deeper behind the mask of the Conservative Revolution, and may soon wonder at Phil Gramm's claim that "I begin this race in a stronger position than any candidate has ever begun a race for the presidency."

American economist and statesman Lyndon LaRouche, in his radio interview with "EIR Talks" on March 1, denounced "the populist nuts of America who have been campaigning to have a balanced budget amendment." The complete collapse of Britain's Barings Bank had just reconfirmed his ninth economic forecast. "The only thing that could be done to keep the United States and other nations from plunging into the depths of the worst depression in perhaps the past 500-odd years," LaRouche said, "would be the United States using its power of debt to replace a *new* financial system to reorganize the system which it's put into bankruptcy, to keep us going." The proposed amendment "would prevent that, and prevent a number of other things," he said. "If this amendment goes through, the United States is virtually a gone bunny as a nation."

Russian lawmakers say IMF 'reforms' are dead

by Jeffrey Steinberg

Three leaders of the emerging political institutions in Russia have called upon the United States to abandon its support for monetarist policies and help Russia steer a new, post-communist course more in line with the national school of political-economy associated with America's 19th-century economic boom, and best represented today by Lyndon LaRouche.

Adrian G. Puzanovsky, deputy chairman of the Committee on Economic Policy in the Russian Duma (parliament); Nikolai A. Chukanov, also a member of the Duma and co-chairman of the Regions of Russia Association; and Gennadi Sklyar, a member of the Council of the Public Chamber attached to the office of the President of the Russian Federation, spoke to the Washington press corps at the National Press Club on March 2. They delivered their frank assessment of the political and economic crisis in Russia, and expressed their concerns about the judicial railroad of Lyndon LaRouche. The three were in Washington for a week of meetings sponsored by the Schiller Institute.

Monetarism is killing Russia

Puzanovsky delivered an assessment of what 10 years of perestroika has done to Russia: The country is now deindustrialized, science and education have been degraded, and worst of all, Russia is being depopulated. "Never in modern Russian history has the population fallen. We have gone 30 years backward in standard of living. It can only be compared to Africa," he stated. Puzanovsky attributed this crisis to Russia's "naive and uncritical acceptance of monetarism, our one-sided belief in the open market."

Now, however, Russian parliamentarians and intellectuals, convinced of the bankruptcy of monetarism, are studying alternate economic models. Puzanovsky cited U.S. President Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal program, the theoretical heritage of the national school of political-economy, and the recent writings of Lyndon LaRouche as "intellectual resources" that are being tapped in the effort to forge a new direction for the reform process. Puzanovsky co-chaired hearings in February in the Duma on the defense of domestic markets, during which a policy statement by LaRouche on the Russian economy was presented on LaRouche's behalf.

Puzanovsky identified LaRouche and Alvin Toffler as two Americans whose contending ideas are being hotly debated among the Russian intelligentsia today. In response to

a question, Puzanovsky voiced his personal preference for LaRouche's work, citing LaRouche's proposals for a new "Silk Road" and a development corridor down through the Adriatic region as particularly exciting proposals.

Sklyar was equally blunt in his assessment of the Russian crisis, which he described as a "crisis of our way of life." Every political institution, especially the office of the President, is at a low point of popularity, he said. "Criminals and speculators live best and there is a huge and growing polarization, with the poor becoming poorer and more numerous. . . . We cannot let Russia become a country of bandits and speculators."

Chukanov added his voice: "Russia must develop new institutions with new policies that are neither communist nor primitive monetarist."

Constitutional elections key

All three Russians emphasized the importance of the upcoming elections in Russia. In December, there are nationwide elections for the Duma, and sometime in 1996, a presidential election is to take place, according to the Constitution. Sklyar cautioned that the entourage surrounding President Boris Yeltsin are desperate to cling to power. "They know that the alternative to power is going to prison, and so they will fight hard to remain in power," he said.

If the elections go forward, the Russians predicted that a new center-left combination would emerge inside the Duma. Chukanov emphasized the role of the independently elected members of the Duma (as opposed to those who were elected as part of the party slates and linked to either Yeltsin or Vladimir Zhirinovskiy), which now constitute the second largest voting bloc in the body. Chukanov is the co-chairman of a newly formed organization called the Regions of Russia Association, which represents three-quarters of the autonomous regions inside the Russian Federation. At a founding conference on Jan. 28, Chukanov was placed in charge of drafting a platform for the organization. He told the Press Club audience that he is working on a comprehensive set of tax and investment laws that would remove some of the onerous tax burden from private companies, would provide for investment tax credits to encourage Russian savings to be directed into industrial growth, and other measures.

All three men also emphasized that they would raise their concerns about the LaRouche prosecution during meetings in Washington. Chukanov noted ironically that in Russia, LaRouche is known as a leading critic of the monetarist policies that have wreaked havoc on the nation, but that it appears that criticism of monetarism is forbidden in the United States. He said that the use of the power of the courts and of the state to silence an opponent was a standard practice of the Soviet Marxist state, and that the treatment that LaRouche received in the United States is therefore not unfamiliar to Russians.

U.S. Supreme Court realignment puts Rehnquist in minority

by Edward Spannaus

Chief Justice William Rehnquist, who has sanctioned the execution of innocent prisoners and all but destroyed the U.S. Supreme Court as the guardian of constitutional rights, has recently found himself in the minority on a couple of important cases. With two new Clinton appointees—Associate Justices Stephen Breyer and Ruth Bader Ginsburg—the high court has taken a couple of small steps back from the bloodthirsty practices of Rehnquist and his allies which have dominated it for more than a decade.

In recent years, the Supreme Court under Rehnquist's domination was reversing precedents willy-nilly and throwing out fundamental constitutional rights, virtually destroying the constitutional function of the Supreme Court as the supreme and independent guardian of the rights of citizens under the U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Two of Rehnquist's favorite dogmas have been "finality of judgments" and "federal-state comity." This is just technical language for "states' rights"—meaning that if a state convicts a defendant, rightly or wrongly, the federal courts should not interfere by "second-guessing" the state courts. Never mind that this nation fought a bloody civil war to establish the principle that the federal Constitution and the federal Union are superior to the states. For Bloodthirsty Bill Rehnquist, it is better to permit a state to execute an innocent prisoner, than for the federal courts to "interfere" with the "finality" of the state's judgment.

This reached the point where, in 1992, even judges who supported the death penalty—Harry Blackmun, John Paul Stevens, and Sandra Day O'Connor—began to question whether it could be fairly applied because of the rulings of the Rehnquist majority.

A step in the right direction

The two recent rulings which indicate that the court is pulling back, if ever so slightly, from the extremes of the Rehnquist majority, came on Jan. 23 and Feb. 21.

In the first ruling, Clinton appointees Breyer and Ginsburg were part of a 5-4 majority issuing a ruling which slightly eased the standard for a showing of so-called "actual innocence"; this ruling came in a *habeas corpus* case involving a