

The economy doesn't function without a plan

Illarionov arrives, through his pseudoscientific statistical manipulations, at the conclusion that the cause of the current situation in Russia is “the system of centralized planning, which ruled the country for seven decades.” In order to appear more balanced, the author also invokes the “consistently interventionist and populist economic policy” of the past decade. But, Illarionov proposes nothing new, other than “the conduct of a consistent liberal policy under market conditions.”

These conclusions testify to the author's ignorance not only of the realities of the U.S.S.R.'s economic development, but also of the world economy. Of course, there were shortcomings and excesses in the Soviet planning system. It is just as well known, however, that not a single economic structure, from the household and the firm to the state and the international community, could function without a plan. Nor does a single country in the world, have pure “free trade.” President Franklin Delano Roosevelt's New Deal policy in the United States during the 1930s, was a program to exit from the economic crisis, with organized public works for employing the unemployed, and so forth. In the Second World War, it was a planned economy, that emerged victorious. Post-war reconstruction was accomplished according to precisely planned state and international economic policies, not only in the U.S.S.R., but in France, Germany, Japan, and elsewhere. President Charles de Gaulle of France stated outright, that his economic policy was based on “dirigist planning.”

On none of these occasions, except in Russia and Eastern Europe in the early 1990s, did anybody proclaim “free trade” and other “liberal values” as a program for exiting from a crisis. Experience has shown us, that such measures would more accurately be termed a program to compound a crisis. Realizing this, several countries in Southeast Asia, taking the initiative from Premier Mahathir bin Mohamad of Malaysia, have undertaken to develop anti-liberal programs. In the first year of successful implementation of a policy of combatting currency speculators, with capital and exchange controls, Malaysia has experienced palpable economic and social results. Thus, Illarionov's conclusions rest not only on his manipulation or cover-up of statistical data about the development of the U.S.S.R. and Russia, but also on his ignorance of world experience.

One can only regret, that an “analyst” of this type would show up as an economic adviser to V.V. Putin, never mind as a candidate for high government office. Can a person who opposes state regulation of the economy, work even as a lowly clerk, in the Ministry of Economics? Yet the media, lately, are rife with rumors that A.I. Illarionov might be appointed Minister of Economics by President Putin. If he did this, the new President would have opened up new passageways for the penetration of immorality into the real economic policy which our country so badly needs.

British establishment promotes new Opium War

by Mark Burdman

The modern-day political and philosophical descendants of those British imperial families and policymakers who mobilized two Opium Wars against China in the 19th century, have now gone on the offensive, to bring about the legalization of drugs in the United Kingdom. In the most immediate sense, the target of this new offensive is the population of Britain itself, as the country threatens to be turned into a world center for narcotics-trafficking, and as domestic drug abuse threatens to reach epidemic proportions. The legalization offensive also has obvious international implications, as it opens the door to drug-legalization offensives in the United States and other countries, and undermines those regimes, such as that of Peruvian President Alberto Fujimori, who have been fighting to destroy the drug trade.

The relevant British influentials, including individuals in the royal family entourage, are reviving those methods by which the British Empire ruled during its heyday. In more modern terms of reference, these are the methods advised by British author and drug-user Aldous Huxley, in his book *Brave New World*, on how drugs should be used for social control and social engineering. At a time when a vast economic and social crisis looms just over the horizon, as the world financial system careens toward disintegration, it is hardly surprising that these establishment institutions and individuals would be pushing to legalize drugs.

The drug-legalization offensive is consistent with some of the main initiatives of British Prime Minister Tony Blair's foreign policy. For example, it was Blair, together with U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and her clique in Washington, who set up the March 1999 NATO war in Kosovo. That war has been declared a great “success” by NATO and its spin-doctors. But the fact is, Kosovo has, in the months since the war ended in June of last year, become Europe's main transshipment center for narcotics, as the March 13 *Guardian* and other British media have exposed. As *EIR* reported last week, Kosovo itself is under effective control of drug-trafficking mafias and organized-crime clans. This reality exposes Blair's supposed opposition to drug legalization as a fraud, and puts him in bed with that establishment mob now heading the legalization offensive.

Two political earthquakes

During the week of March 27, two extraordinary developments occurred in the United Kingdom, by which leading

elements of the British establishment proclaimed their intent to sabotage the war on drugs, and make drugs legal.

First, the London-based Police Foundation, whose president is the Royal Heir (or Air-Head) Prince Charles, released its long-awaited report, "Drugs and the Law." The report promotes lowering the penalties for use of cannabis, LSD, and Ecstasy. It affirms that "the eradication of drug use is not achievable, and is not therefore either a realistic or a sensible goal of public policy," and insists that a revised law should be "realistically enforceable." On cannabis, the report lies, that "by any of the main criteria of harm—mortality, morbidity, toxicity, addictiveness, and relationship with crime—it is less harmful to the individual and society than of the other major illicit drugs, or than alcohol and tobacco."

Using the formulation typical for oligarchical tyrannies throughout the ages, the report concludes that the law must be brought "into line with public opinion."

The study was headed by Viscountess Runciman of Doxford, the wife of the scion of one of Britain's more influential establishment families. She was formerly chairman of both the Advisory Council on the Misuse of Drugs and the Mental Health Act Commission. For years, she has advocated what she calls a "more realistic approach" toward dealing with drugs, which is a euphemism for supporting de facto legalization without saying so.

A couple of members of the Police Foundation inquiry team are senior police officers. One, John Hamilton, Chief Constable of Fife, was evidently brainwashed after visiting the legal "cannabis cafés" in Amsterdam, having gushed thereafter that he found a "relaxed and unthreatening atmosphere" prevailing there.

The fact that Prince Charles is the president of the Police Foundation, is coherent with the long history of royal family promotion of drugs, a fact underscored by Queen Victoria's liberal use of opiates and other mind-altering substances during the 19th century.

The second crucial development was a 180-degree turnaround in the editorial position of the leading "conservative" newspaper in Great Britain, the *Daily Telegraph*, which is owned by Canadian Privy Council member Conrad Black's Hollinger Corp. Heretofore, having always taken a position favoring a war on drugs, the *Telegraph* on March 30, in an editorial entitled "An Experiment with Cannabis," called for the British government to "draw up plans to legalize cannabis . . . both for its consumption and its supply." The paper argued: "People like substances that alter their mood, and only strict puritans believe that they should never use any of them. A cup of coffee, a glass of wine or beer, even the odd cigarette are among the legitimate pleasures of life. Are drugs fundamentally different?"

The *Telegraph's* editor, Charles Moore, is a worshipper of former Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher. While sharing her bizarre and destructive "radical free market" views, Moore had always, previously, posed as a "conservative mor-

alist." Moore's editorial usefully rips the cover off of Thatcherite policies. In fact, for years, one of the leading British advocates of drug legalization has been Lord Harris of High Cross, the outspoken "free market" ideologue who boasts that he was responsible for "creating" Thatcher, in the 1970s, during the days he headed London's Institute of Economic Affairs, the chief "free market" think-tank in Britain.

One day before the *Telegraph* editorial, the tabloid *Daily Mail*, which had also always taken a strict view against drug decriminalization/legalization, had also made an editorial about-face.

These papers now join the *Economist* magazine, which has for years advocated drug legalization. The *Economist* was founded in the 1840s, the high-point of the British Empire, in the period of the Opium Wars that flooded China with drugs.

'Legalize all of them'

That the *Telegraph* would so openly advocate legalization, is generating a sea-change, and curious realignments, in the British political atmosphere. For example, on April 4, British Labour Party parliamentarian Paul Flynn, who is on the left spectrum of the party, and who has campaigned for years to change Britain's drug laws, tabled a motion in the House of Commons, congratulating the *Telegraph* for its "intelligent progressive call to legalize cannabis for an experimental period." Flynn is soon to put forward legislation, by which cannabis would be legalized, for a four-year trial period.

Representing the more "liberal" spectrum of the establishment, the April 2 *Observer* ran a euphoric two-page feature entitled "A Taboo Goes Up in Smoke," with the kicker: "When Even the Establishment Starts Calling for Cannabis To Be Legalized, It's Time To Take Notice." The paper gushed about the *Telegraph* and *Mail* editorials. Accompanying this was an article by Toby Young, entitled "Coke, Dope, E [for Ecstasy]—Legalize All of Them." Flaunting his own frequent use of drugs, the *Observer* degenerate concluded with this astonishing contention: "The truth is, provided they're taken in moderation, cocaine and heroin are no more dangerous than cannabis and E," and that, therefore, Prince Charles's Police Foundation has not gone far enough!

A somewhat more "respectable" degenerate, neo-conservative London *Times* columnist Mary Ann Sieghart, was euphoric about the *Telegraph* and *Mail* turnabouts. In a March 31 column, she gushed that this was as monumental an event as when Thatcher, in 1988, endorsed the "global warming" line, and brought "conservatives" into alignment with environmentalists. In earlier columns, Sieghart had argued that pro-legalization politicians are the wave of the future, because the majority of active voters are Baby Boomers and "'68ers," who used drugs in their youth.

Estimates are that a good number of Blair Cabinet members have used cannabis, and perhaps harder drugs. Cabinet "Enforcer" (her official title) Mo Mowlam, former Northern



Conrad Black. The 180-degree turnaround in the editorial position of the leading "conservative" newspaper in Britain, the Daily Telegraph, owned by Canadian Privy Council member Conrad Black's Hollinger Corp., has given drug legalization a big boost.

Ireland Secretary, has publicly admitted to smoking cannabis in former years, and is known to favor a softening of drug laws.

Also, *Times* former editor Simon Jenkins has promoted decriminalization/legalization. Jenkins is a member of the Police Foundation "Drugs and the Law" task force. Previously, Jenkins had known his better moments, as an ardent opponent of the wars against Iraq and Yugoslavia.

A national drug-abuse plague

In public, Blair, Home Secretary Jack Straw, and British "drugs czar" Keith Hellawell, have maintained their opposition to drug decriminalization/legalization, probably due to pressure from the Clinton White House and from White House anti-drug coordinator Gen. Barry McCaffrey (ret.)—who, by the way, was subjected to some nasty pro-drug demonstrations when he visited Britain some months back. Straw, in particular, has been in a somewhat embarrassing position, because, some years ago, his son was arrested for possessing cannabis.

But, since the *Telegraph-Mail* offensive and the release of the Police Foundation report, Straw has modified his stance, and, in an article in the *News of the World* tabloid over the April 1-2 weekend, he welcomed a national debate on drug policy.

The way legalization is being "sold" to the British public, is with the perverse argument that, because drug usage is so

widespread in Britain, it is no longer possible to enforce the 1971 Misuse of Drugs Act. As the pro-legalization *Observer* piece cited above pointed out, since that act was passed 30 years ago, "the number of known drug addicts has risen from 3,000 to 43,000. Unofficial estimates put the latter figure at nearer 200,000, mostly youngsters. Some 2,000 people will die of drug abuse this year."

On April 4, a report authored by two University of Manchester researchers, on behalf of a leading drug research charity called DrugScope, which had received funding from the British Department of Health, was released. Entitled "Hidden Heroin Users," the report revealed that the number of teenagers using heroin and crack cocaine is increasing at an unprecedented rate, with a growing pattern of heroin use among youths as young as 15. The report warned that drug addiction is spreading rapidly in both towns and rural areas in the United Kingdom. Furthermore, an exceptionally high number of the teenage users had tried other drugs: 99% had tried cannabis; 92%, amphetamines; 83%, LSD; 81%, methadone; 75%, crack cocaine; and 55%, cocaine.

The enormous figure of cannabis use sharply contradicts the Big Lie, that "hard drug" use does not begin with "soft drug" use, or, conversely, that the latter does not lead to the former. It also shows the extent of the social-economic-cultural collapse throughout Britain, belying Blairite propaganda about a "booming economy" and national "optimism about the future."

'Practices that kill and damage'

Thankfully, there are some voices of opposition being raised to this madness. One such voice is commentator Mary Kenny, writing, ironically, in the April 3 *Sunday Telegraph*, under the title, "Stay Hard on Soft Drugs."

Kenny began: "I am always wary of any polemic that begins, 'They do these things so much better in Holland.'" She warned that the "Dutch model" on drugs, centered on effective legalization of cannabis, is a fraud, as the country has become "a crossroads in Europe for the trafficking in hard drugs." The country is a major supply route for heroin and cocaine. "The much-praised Dutch soft-drugs policy has facilitated, willy-nilly, the hard-drug barons who make Amsterdam and Rotterdam their bases," she said.

On cannabis as such, Kenny wrote that it is "at least four times more carcinogenic than tobacco, when smoked. A joint of cannabis contains a cocktail of 2,000 chemicals, which can lead to cancer of the tongue, mouth, throat, esophagus, and lungs. It can promote chromosome damage and lead to the early onset of senility by breaking down the brain's synapses. . . . At a time when there is so much emphasis on quitting smoking tobacco, it seems incongruous to endorse what may be a much more damaging substance. . . . We should draw back from signals of approval or endorsement of practices that kill and damage, most especially the young and the vulnerable."