

## Eye on Washington by Judy Hodgkiss

### Barry bucks Conservative Revolution

*The mayor's revised budget plan includes no further layoffs of city workers, and no further cuts in services.*

As Thomas Davis (R-Va.), the chairman of the House Appropriations District of Columbia subcommittee, looked on, D.C. Mayor Marion Barry declared to a meeting of business leaders on March 10 that he would not allow Congress "to usurp my authority." Referring to a congressional threat to establish a financial control board over the District by the end of March, Barry said, "I am telling you that they [Congress] cannot do this without my participation and the citizens of Washington and the workers."

Barry angered the Gingrichites in Congress when, on March 8, he released his revised budget for 1995, and included no further layoffs of city workers nor other major cuts in services in his \$3.52 billion proposal. To balance the budget, he instead called on Congress to grant the District more than \$600 million in restitution for problems left over from the "home rule" arrangement that Congress drafted in 1966. He requested that the federal government take over a number of functions that the city administers, such as prisons and Medicaid, which are normally handled by states.

"Congress has taken zero steps. They have not done one thing. I have taken all the action," Barry said, referring to his previous cuts which are now taking a devastating toll on the city. "Maybe people don't see the bleeding on the streets, but [the cuts] are real. I don't think anyone ought to deprecate how tough it has been to reduce this budget by \$300 million. . . . Some people just want to see blood."

The reaction has been swift from austerity-mongers in Congress who have been pushing for a bankers' dic-

tatorship over D.C. Gil Gutknecht (R-Minn.), a member of the House D.C. subcommittee, said, "Instead of an act of contrition, we are seeing an act of contempt. It leaves the impression . . . that the city isn't interested in cooperating." Subcommittee member Henry Bonilla (R-Tex.) said, "I'm stunned, and I think it is absurd for him to ask for more money to spend this year."

Jim Jeffords (R-Vt.), chairman of the Senate Appropriations subcommittee on the District, said that it was Barry's "attitude" that was the problem.

Davis, who shared the podium with Barry on March 10, said on March 12 that city officials "don't want to make the tough decisions." The reason, he said, was that "the culture of the city has slowed everything down."

Barry responded: "The majority of people hostile and critical are Republicans, and mostly freshmen. I expected they would be harsh because I'm shifting the responsibility to the federal government. . . . The Republican Party is about cutting out a lot of social programs, so they have to be convinced there is a need."

Barry has proposed that civic organizations and trade unions organize lobbying teams to visit each congressman on the D.C. oversight committees. "We want a partnership with the people, a partnership with Congress, partnership with anyone who wants to partnership with us. When we finish our lobbying, Congress is going to be forthcoming with some money," he said. "I have the faith that we are going to get what we need. . . . When

congresspeople see these health clinics having been closed, and 12 recreation centers closed, and workers screaming and yelling about these reductions and mothers on welfare saying you've cut us too much, they're going to know then we've done all we can do."

But the British oligarchical controllers of the Conservative Revolution crowd in Congress have their own scenario for D.C. British press outlets are "predicting" that riots will hit the city this summer. On March 12, the London *Sunday Times* was headlined: "Riot Fear Looms over Washington." It began, "America's capital is preparing for a long, hot summer of violence." The paper, home of Conservative Revolution guru Lord William Rees-Mogg, said that "police and moderate leaders fear" that the budget crisis "will be used by militant black groups," which will be a "recipe for a serious outbreak of urban violence."

The danger is that the British intelligence role in orchestrating riots will be ignored. For example, D.C. Councilman William Lightfoot dismissed the *Times's* and a similar report in the London *Guardian* in a TV interview, saying, "This is only a case of sensationalism on the part of the foreign press."

This attention on D.C., with its population of 570,000, is part of a British-led effort to surround President Clinton with a heightened security threat. The fear in London is that the President of the United States might, based on his anti-British inclinations, orient toward Lyndon LaRouche's "American System" economics. And, the signs of resistance to the Conservative Revolution austerity, and the fact that D.C. has the highest per-capita circulation of LaRouche-authored policy statements in the nation, is a situation the British prefer to sidetrack into rioting.