

Federal 'gridlock' intended as pretext to scrap Constitution

by Susan Kokinda, Washington correspondent

Talk of a "collision course" with Congress over economic and defense policy has intensified as the House Republican leadership balked over President Reagan's militant "stay the course" intentions. On Nov. 18, House Republican leader Robert Michel (R-Ill.) left a White House meeting and declared that there was no more room for cuts in domestic spending. Michel's announcement, immediately tagged a "revolt" by the White House press corps, came two days after President Reagan announced in a New Orleans speech that he hoped to accelerate his 1983 tax cut, maintain the proposed level of defense spending, and that it was in the area of domestic spending that further cuts would have to be made.

Governmental gridlock between President Reagan and the Congress has now emerged as a distinct possibility, during both the December lame duck session, and more importantly in the 98th Congress convening in January. Such a "failure of government" is tailor-made for Secretary of State George Shultz and his team of "crisis managers" to step into the breach and implement more severe austerity measures than have been seen already. Shultz, in league with the AFL-CIO's Lane Kirkland, is fanning the congressional revolt from behind the scenes, in an effort to weaken the resistance of the President to such "crisis management."

It is no coincidence, therefore, that simultaneous with the emergence of this "deadlock in crisis" scenario, an elite group of anglophile policy makers, with George Shultz's personal counsel and Trilateral Commission member Lloyd Cutler at its head, has publicly surfaced a debate over the need for a complete overhaul of the American Constitutional structure and its replacement by a British parliamentary system. Their

concern is that pro-constitutional forces will ultimately resist the demands of the supranational Malthusian for more and more austerity. To forestall such resistance, this anti-republican elite would tear down the very fabric of the Constitutional system.

The *EIR* of the week of Nov. 16 exposed the existence of the semisecret Committee on the Constitutional System (CCS). *EIR* founder Lyndon H. LaRouche's precise formulation of the oligarchy as "neo-Malthusian world federalists" is nowhere more clearly represented than in the composition of the CCS. Top genocidalists and Anglo-Saxon racists from the Committee for the Year 2000, the Club of Rome and the Population Crisis Committee, such as Robert "Bodycount" McNamara, William Fulbright, Elliot Richardson, Walter Cronkite, and Sen. Claiborne Pell, sit side by side with such avowed Tories and apologists for the British parliamentary system as Lloyd Cutler, C. Douglas Dillon, James McGregor Burns, the Christian Science Monitor's Richard Strout, and Brookings' James Sundquist. The major target of the CCS, as of Ted Kennedy's similar constitution-wrecking Project '87, is the dissolution of the separation-of-powers doctrine, which has thus far enabled the American system to resist wholesale supranational control.

Setting the stage

While the CCS will plot in secret (and will not reveal its sources of private funding), it was determined that public perception might be softened up by surfacing the debate into the public domain. The instrument was to be Rep. Reuss' Joint Economic Committee, which conducted three days of

hearings from Nov. 9 to 18 on "Political Economy: How to Make the Government Work." A full complement of the oligarchy's neo-Malthusians and British apologists were present: Fulbright, Cutler, Dillon, Richardson, John B. Anderson, Strout, Burns, Sundquist and others.

In his press release announcing the hearings, Reuss puts the austerity issue right up front: "There is an unspoken assumption about our political system . . . that it will inevitably survive any economic disaster, however severe. But how secure are we, really? . . ." Burns was even more blunt about the opportunity presented by such economic dissolution, predicting a "series of national and worldwide crises which will so sorely test our national institutions, that, suddenly, many will understand the need for constitutional change and we must be ready." Dillon cited the "great danger of a very serious economic problem in the near future," and the threat of thermonuclear war.

In fact, it is precisely the extent to which American republican principles of technological progress have been violated and replaced by the systems analysis form of genocide practiced by the International Monetary Fund, and the sister form of austerity practiced by the Federal Reserve and the Office of Management and Budget, that any crisis exists. Shultz, who as recently as his Nov. 18 press conference publicly embraced the IMF's international enforcer Henry Kissinger, is directing the American deployment against the efforts of Lyndon LaRouche and allied forces to effect a Hamiltonian solution to the international debt crisis. Shultz continues to arrogate domestic economic policy making power, attending a recent White House briefing, as one participant noted, "wearing his economic and budget hats, not his State Department hat." Shultz' budget hat is old hat, since he was the first director of the then-newly-created Office of Management and Budget in 1970. It is that increasingly dominant budget process, in which the Federal Reserve Board controls economic reality from outside the "process," which has strait-jacketed Reagan and the congress into the confrontation over non-issues pending in 1983. Congress, especially, has nearly ceased its legislative functions, under the now all-engrossing functions of the "budget process."

New requirements of global genocide

Yet, despite the past and present capabilities to implement austerity which Shultz and his fellow travelers have put into place over the years, the magnitude of the current crisis demands more. Herein lies the oligarchy's need to finally crush that unique ability of the constitutional system to resist Malthusian policies. Elliot Richardson, who testified on Nov. 17 and nominally opposed constitutional reform of the parliamentary type, merely proposed it in a different guise. Richardson suggested that most of the problems of the U.S. government could be solved if an adequate data base for more comprehensive global modeling and forecasting were to be adopted. Asked afterwards by *EIR* to elaborate, Richardson immediately pointed to the *Global 2000 Report*, which ad-

vocates the elimination of 2 billion people by the year 2000, and to the efforts of the super-elite Committee for the Year 2000 to establish an office in the executive branch whose purpose would be to impose the Malthusian constructs of Global 2000 on U.S. policy making. Richardson revealed that the Year 2000 Committee is preparing legislation to create such a global modeling office in the executive branch. A few minutes after this exchange, Richardson reminded Chairman Reuss that Walter Cronkite is co-chair of the Year 2000 Committee. Cronkite, of course, serves on the Committee on Constitutional Systems. What Richardson did not mention was that George Shultz was about to join the Year 2000 Committee, when called to replace Alexander Haig. The annoying necessity of taking an oath of office precluded Shultz from openly affirming his higher allegiance.

The genocidalists' concepts of futurism permeated other testimony as well. James McGregor Burns, a long-time parliamentary sympathizer of the CCS, declared that one of the most serious penalties paid by the United States for its inefficient form of government is the "inability to engage in realistic, comprehensive planning." With the eugenicist immigration movement of previous decades hovering in the background, Burns cited America's failure to more carefully plan immigration policy as his prime example.

Another CCS member and Trilateral Commission member, Sen. William Roth (R-Del.), is running a parallel operation against the executive branch, with his proposed new "Hoover Commission," which would streamline the executive along more "efficient" lines.

World Federalist attack on nation state

As long as sovereignty resides in the constituency-based institutions of the American constitutional republic, as long as those constituency-based institutions can be made to operate for the good by a powerful political movement, such as that represented by Lyndon LaRouche's economic development-based peace movement (see Special Report), the oligarchy stands in danger of losing control in the U.S.A.

Throughout the JEC hearings, Reuss deprecated this constituency-based activity as "errand running," suggested that an ombudsman take over those functions from legislators, allowing them to focus on national policies. Other witnesses such as Sen. Lloyd Bentsen (D-Tex.), Cutler, and Fulbright, proposed extending the length of terms of office of members of Congress and the President so as to avoid the "distractions" of reelection. Various proposals were advanced to limit the President to one six-year term and to similarly cap the number of terms of Congressmen and Senators, again to avoid the reality of facing the voters.

Crucial also to the parliamentary reformers' schemes is tightly interlocking the executive and legislature so as to enhance the "efficient" implementation of Malthusian dictates of their global "Privy Councils." In his Nov. 9 testimony, Cutler admits that the paralysis of government brought about by separation of powers has manifested itself most in

the areas of national security and economic policy, precisely "because of the growing interdependence of the world, and because the President of the United States remains the only world leader who cannot commit the government he heads to the necessary policies." This is the content of the attack on the doctrine of separation of powers. They justify it by arguing that the Founding Fathers' fears that national sovereignty could be subverted by oligarchical demagogues and cliques—fears which motivated the doctrine of checks and balances—are no longer valid!

In order to eliminate the ability of each branch of government to resist such subversion, the wreckers propose that the President, members of the House, and a proportion of the Senate be placed on one line on the ballot, forcing voters to vote for an entire party slate. Other parliamentary proposals, notably advanced by Reuss, including allowing the President to draw his Cabinet from the legislature, and the breaking of deadlocks by providing for either the President or the legislature to call for new elections. Even Richardson noted that such a reform of the American structure would yield such instability as to "make Italy in the post-war period look like the Rock of Gibraltar."

The Senate "delaying tactics" and its ability to reject treaties by only one-third of the Senate came under special attack by Reuss. As well, Sen. Mathias, under his chairmanship of the Rules Committee, has empaneled a commission to examine how to streamline the procedures of the Senate.

The charter members of the Paul Volcker Protection Racket in the House of Representatives—Speaker Tip O'Neill, Henry Reuss, Richard Gephardt (D-Mo.), Tim Wirth (D-Colo.), and Leon Panetta (D-Cal.) are pushing for tighter party discipline and threatening to "punish" those boll weevils and other Democrats who voted their constituencies in the 97th Congress rather than the policies of the Volcker-supporting Democratic Party leadership.

That the servile British Parliament and party structure is the model for these Anglophilic revisionists is nothing new to American political battles. Under the leadership of Woodrow Wilson, the Democratic Party adopted rules binding members to vote according to Democratic caucus dictates in 1911. As Senator Works lamented in the wake of the 1913 passage of the Federal Reserve Act, the policy of caucus discipline was "the most unfortunate feature of legislation under this Administration. Neither would Congress have bowed the knee and surrendered to the monied interests of the country the ownership and control of the reserve banks with enormous power that goes with them."

The parliamentary coup which was the enactment of the Federal Reserve system had come as the culmination of 40 years of oligarchical subversion, which began in the post-Civil War period. The oligarchs have long memories. The unfinished assaults on the sovereign American nation represented by the Species Resumption Act, the Federal Reserve Act, the budget process and Global 2000, are to them merely the precursors of their current intention to finish the job.

The World Wildlife Fund: lock away the resources

by Lonnie Wolfe

Last month, at a press conference in Bali, Indonesia, the World Wildlife Fund, the international elite of the environmental movement headed by Britain's Prince Philip, launched what it termed "the most important environmental campaign in history."

Ostensibly aimed at protecting jungle habitats and tropical rain forests, the Fund's oligarchical controllers have made clear that the real goal of the campaign is to halt prospects for the industrial development of the impoverished nations of the developing sector. By so doing, the World Wildlife Fund hopes to stop the development of sovereign nation-states which can challenge the neo-colonial domination of the world by the oligarchical families and their retinue.

According to sources in the U.S. intelligence community, the Fund is targeting several development projects in Africa, Asia, and Ibero-America, and its primary focus will be to stop the industrial development of Brazil's rain forest areas. Prince Philip and other World Wildlife Fund leaders expressly fear resource-rich Brazil's potential development into a world superpower and plan to stop this at all costs. According to one source, the Fund views its operations as a direct counter to American political leader Lyndon H. LaRouche and his mobilization for an Ibero-American debt bomb and an Ibero-American common market, a plan that focuses heavily on Brazil.

What is the World Wildlife Fund?

The World Wildlife Fund was created in 1961 at the personal instigation of Holland's Prince Bernhard, later a central figure in the Lockheed scandal, and the British royal family. Its international executive includes most of the crowned heads of Europe and leading members of the world's black oligarchical families.

These networks deploy their forces cooperatively with the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), founded in the early 1950s by British intelligence operative Julian Huxley, then working for the United Nations Education and Social Organization (UNESCO). Both the World Wildlife Fund and IUCN work closely with the Draper Fund, for Population Activities, an international command post of the population-reduction movement.