

Bankers' dictatorship makes Washington a death camp

by Dennis Speed

In this *Investigation*, we seek to “walk the reader through” an ongoing national tragedy: the deliberate destruction of the city of Washington, D.C. That destruction is the product of the interplay of a set of false assumptions about economic policy, which are shared by groups bitterly opposed to each other—by the descendants of the arch-segregationists, once known as Dixiecrats; the New Age “Conservative Revolutionaries” that now dominate the House and Senate District Committees; and by the now-displaced political machinery of Washington, D.C. and its activist core, centered around Mayor Marion Barry.

Many of those who have been bitterly opposed to placing the mayoralty into receivership, to the creation of an imperial Financial Control Board similar to the one imposed on New York City in 1975, and to the eradication of the power of elected bodies like the D.C. School Board, still state that they must seek to work, in whatever way is possible, with the Financial Control Board, to establish “sound fiscal management policy” for the District. It is precisely the attempt to abide by that suicidal “sound fiscal management policy,” however, that has created the problem, exacerbated each day, in the city of Washington, as well as in Federal budget policy (for example, the lunacy of a “balanced budget amendment”) and throughout the world. As a result, those opposing the Nazi-like implications of the measures now being implemented in Washington, D.C., are powerless to mobilize the sleeping electorate, soon to become a non-electorate, to stop such measures, because they lack the moral authority that comes from rejecting the “balanced budget” premise.

No one, during the city’s recent crisis, has dared to oppose the erroneous axiom, that less money should be spent in Washington, D.C. In fact, capital expenditures for hard infrastructure, such as roads, and soft infrastructure, such as

schools and hospitals, must be drastically increased, as is true in most American cities. But Washington is *not* most cities. It is the nation’s capital, and represents, in whatever is done there, a national policy-trend.

Moreover, it is clear, that Mayor Marion Barry had been, in large part, *implementing* radical austerity in the nation’s capital in the past several years. Barry, who went to jail for six months on Oct. 26, 1991, was elected to the City Council for Ward 8 in November 1992. Once it became clear that he would be again elected mayor in November 1994, in one of the most astounding political comebacks in U.S. history, it appears that those in the financial establishment controlling the D.C. area (including the “horse set” from Northern Virginia), readjusted their plans for their ultimate retaking of the city.

The idea was simple. Using the old tactic pioneered by the originators of the Ku Klux Klan in South Carolina, during the Reconstruction government of 1867-76 (and recently resurrected for use in that state against African-American elected officials, in what became notorious as the FBI Frühmenschen-inspired “Operation Lost Trust”), the “Conservative Revolutionaries” would simply claim, every six months or so, that whatever set of toadies, or flunkies, could be assembled to “take the job of the last set of incompetents,” would, in turn, be run out of town. This circus would prove so morally enervating, that the residents of the District would either *welcome* a takeover from the Congress, or would no longer resist it. (Then, the same tactic would be rendered safe to use anywhere else that such “electoral incompetence” were found—Cleveland, Newark, perhaps Detroit, for example. This would be done, on the grounds that anyone who accepts it in Washington, but rejects it in “their” case, is guilty of “double standards,” perhaps even “racism.” In this way, the modern-day



The poverty and suffering of citizens in the nation's capital are the result of the wrong-headed, but pervasive, axiomatic belief that "too much money" is being spent on the city.

followers of Nazi Economics Minister Hjalmar Schacht can isolate and destroy each successive victim of their "sound fiscal management.")

Nothing to D.C.'s benefit *can* come from the Financial Control Board. To avoid "sting operations," run by accountants and other scam-artists, it is helpful for the citizen to reflect, that it is a bad idea to go to Dracula for a blood transfusion, even if he shows you his medical degree.

We now show, in part, how the "fiscal efficiency" scam is being run.

How Barry was set up

According to an employee of the soon-to-be-terminated D.C. Office of the Ombudsman, "Two years ago, Mayor Barry had already looked at the reality of where we were, and realized that if we didn't turn a few things around, we were going to 'belly up.' He took the leadership to develop a 'transformation' plan of government, which we've gone ahead with, full force, over the past period. And this is when Congress decided to pull their action. As our transformation program was taking effect, and was becoming rather effective, they threw all these obstacles in our way, basically to make the mayor's transformation program fail. . . . They have done everything to make him look incompetent, and to make every D.C. employee look incompetent."

Vernon Hawkins, now a member of the board of trustees at Union Temple Baptist Church, was for almost a year and a

half the director of the Department of Human Services in the Barry administration that took office in 1995. Hawkins had an accumulated 25 years of service in D.C. government, before he assumed this position. "The first thing that the Department was faced with," he said, "was a \$77 million deficit from the previous administration" of Mayor Sharon Pratt Kelly. But, that was only in *one* department. Kelly, who had replaced Barry as a "good government" candidate, and who campaigned, using a shovel, to "remove the waste from City Hall," claimed a budget deficit of \$100 million when she left office. The actual figure was *\$350 million*—a "nuclear land mine" that was left to be defused by a Barry administration already disliked by Wall Street and the banking establishment.

"Our first task was to reduce that deficit, and to come in with a balanced budget in fiscal year '96. We did that, within the department. In addition to that, we had about \$35 million in 'back pay' bills that had not been paid to previous contractors. . . . The problem that you had with the District government, was one of a contracting process that was antiquated, and, inasmuch as the Department of Human Services represented one-third of the District government, it had the largest number of contracts that had not been put into place in accordance with the contracting procedures. Many contractors were providing vital services to the elderly, handicapped individuals, and others. We had to continue those services without what the Control Board considered a duly authorized contract, until such time that we would get that contract in place.

“When you look back at the system of the D.C. government, it takes you approximately 249 days to get a contract through. That’s the whole apparatus of the District. So we thought it was very unfair, to, after a year and a half, be placed in the position that we had to take on responsibility for resolving all of the District’s problems in its contracting process. And we had some contention with the Authority, in terms of that being the reason to ask that someone else serve in the capacity as director.”

In other words, Barry’s administration was set up to solve a problem that it did not create. Although it successfully balanced the Department of Human Services budget, and acquired special powers from the City Council to repay the \$35 million in “back pay” as well, thus lowering the deficit by \$110 million, the Control Board sought to remove Hawkins, on the “issue” of his alleged “lack of performance.” Barry, in response to these attempts, gave a press conference on June 3, 1996, in which he stated, that the demands for Hawkins’s removal were “absolutely anti-democratic, anti-American, un-American. . . . It reminds me of what happened in Germany during the period when citizens were abrogated—their rights were abrogated—in a totalitarian kind of state.”

“Recognizing that this was a problem area, they used this for political purposes, in my opinion,” Hawkins said, “to simply attack the Barry administration. . . . The claim was that

there was mismanagement, in that there were contracts that were—people were being provided services without a legitimate contract in place. And as a result of that, it did not comply with the District rules, or their order. What we were faced with, is turning out handicapped and elderly individuals on the street, or continuing those services until such time that we could get a contract in place.”

Who’s in control?

The Control Board’s chairman, Andrew Brimmer, is a former member of the Federal Reserve Board, an unconstitutional institution that represents “extra-governmental” authority and financial override of the public welfare. Since July, the Control Board has, in collaboration with the Congress, usurped power from the mayoralty in the District. It now controls the functioning of many agencies, including Administrative Services, Fire and Emergency Medical Services, the Human Services Department once headed by Hawkins, Public Works, Public Health, Consumer and Regulatory Affairs, the D.C. school system, Housing and Community Development—in short, the heart of the mayoralty. The Barry administration runs the office of Tourism, the Office of the Ombudsman (being phased out on Oct. 31), cable television, Office of the City Administrator, Office of Emergency Preparedness, Parks and Recreation, Women’s Commission, the Office of Aging, the Office of Diversity and Special Services, Latino Affairs, Asian Pacific Affairs, and Arts and Humanities. It has been kneecapped, and now the cavemen of the Conservative Revolution are looking for the opportunity for a head-shot.

Brimmer intends to bring in a de facto city manager to oversee the running of these agencies; but he doesn’t want to use that term, because it would betray the fact that the entire government structure has been altered, without benefit of any vote by the citizenry to do so. “I will need a person with substantial managerial experience to help me carry out these responsibilities,” he says. According to Vernon Loeb of the *Washington Post*, “The Control Board chairman also said he would not refer to the new official the board would hire as a ‘city manager,’ which is a specific term that describes an executive at the helm of a government structure, different from the arrangement Congress imposed on the District.”

Brimmer is attempting to appear competent, responsible, “on top of things.” He has only one problem: He, too, is a “fall guy.” He is being used by the Congress in a “tar baby option,” by the which, he, too, will be caught.

It all began with the unfortunate Congressional Delegate Eleanor Holmes Norton, the District’s non-voting representative in Congress (a position created in 1971), and an avowed enemy of Lyndon LaRouche, who co-authored the legislation that created the Control Board in the first place. Next, there was Brimmer. Soon, after the Control Board proves that it, too, cannot solve the problem, it, too, will be replaced, perhaps by a simple return to the pre-1967 colonial arrangement.

DO YOU KNOW

- that the American Revolution was fought ~~against~~ British “free trade” economics?
- that Washington and Franklin championed Big Government?
- that the Founding Fathers promoted partnership between private industry and central government?



Edited by Nancy Spannaus
and Christopher White

READ

The Political Economy of the American Revolution

edited by
Nancy Spannaus and
Christopher White

order from the publisher:

EIR News Service
P.O. Box 17390
Washington, D.C.
20041-0390
or call
**Ben Franklin
Booksellers**
800-453-4108

\$15.00 plus \$4.00 shipping and handling

Already, the Control Board has been blamed, correctly, for the fact that the D.C. public schools opened three weeks late. A parents' group, Parents United, had sued the District *three years ago* for violations in the fire codes, and demanded that repairs be effected prior to the opening of school this fall. The Control Board was fully aware of these demands, but, in a surge of "fiscal responsibility," refused to meet them.

Lt. Gen. Julius Becton, Jr., chairman of the Emergency Transitional Education Board of Trustees, which usurped the power of the 11-man school board created in 1969, and reduced the board to an advisory body, has been particularly embarrassed by the rank "disorder and early sorrow" of the beginning of this school year. The Aug. 9 *Washington Post* reported that "Don Reeves, president of the elected D.C. Board of Education, agreed with Parents United, and called on the chairman of the school system's appointed emergency board of trustees to resign, or accept more responsibility for the repair problems."

But, no one seems to get it. Becton and his board are *supposed* to fail. Assisting him in that goal, as best he can, is North Carolina's Rep. Charles Taylor (R) of the House Appropriations Committee. Taylor, who, through the end of September, proposed a \$300 million cut in the District's budget, was proposing the elimination of 90% of the administrative staff for education—which would have left Becton with one staff member to deal with the District's 78,000 children. Taylor was reined in from this proposal, partially because the *Washington Post*, sensing the acute anger that is brewing in the District, is ever-sensitive to the national political ramifications of having an over-zealous Southern Republican, demand the financial lynching of the District outright.

Fascist economics

"Mr. Taylor wanted to come in and cut \$300 million and 3,000 jobs," said Vernon Hawkins. "Mr. Brimmer now has some feelings for the fact, that, if you do that, you will totally destroy this District government. You will further reduce services to citizens. The average case worker, right now, in the foster care program, is carrying 100 cases, when they should be carrying 25. The average parole officer is supervising more than 150 people; he should be supervising 50. Yes, you're cutting the dollars, but at the same time, you're causing the degradation of the delivery system here. It's just a matter of time before it blows up—Lorton [Correctional Facility] blows up, the correctional system blows up, it's *just a matter of time*. Believe me. The reductions that are being put in place are going to have much more devastating impact on this community than what people have seen."

The idea is to make the lives deemed "not worthy to be lived" in the District, socially expendable, to make them disappear. It is done, in the spirit, if not in the form, of Heinrich Himmler's infamous "Green File," and the Wannsee Conference's "Final Solution." In the following articles, speeches, and interviews, you will be confronted with what is happening

to your fellow citizens in the nation's capital. You will see, that Mayor Barry did not exaggerate, when he compared the anti-human policies of the Confederates in the Congress, to Germany of the 1930s. You will be reminded, that the demand for "order," is always how "it" starts; that the targetting of "the undesirables" is "its" ideological stock-in-trade, and that financial austerity, imitative of that of Hjalmar Schacht, is "its" essence. That "it" has a name, and if you cannot name "it," then you are no true citizen of this republic.

Advocate for the homeless

The heroism of those public servants in D.C., paid and volunteer, who refuse to relinquish their humanity in the face of what is being done to the city, is exemplified by a story told by Terry Bishop, vice-president of the Community for Creative Non-Violence.

"We are in a building, that is a D.C. government building. And we've been in this building for 25 years. The repairs were just so atrocious. And we've been trying for five years to get them to fix the roof, which was leaking all over the place. But, because it was homeless people, no one really cared whether the roof got fixed, or not. I decided, when I came here, 'Well, I don't have the money to fix this'—it was \$500,000 to fix the roof, because it takes up an entire city block. I said, 'I don't have the money, I can't generate that money through donations or anything.' So I called the mayor, I called everybody on the Hill, I wrote the President, I wrote Mr. Brimmer, and I couldn't get anywhere with anyone.

"So, it was in the winter of last year, and I just went and sat in front of the mayor's door. I sat there, and I fasted for 37 days, until everyone got very embarrassed. People were sending in petitions, they were calling and wanting to know 'whether you are going to let that lady sit out there and die.' So, finally, the mayor got the money together, although he had said it was impossible to do it. He got the money together, and right now, we are a couple of weeks away from having the roof completed.

"Just to get something done, for people that no one cares anything about, you have to do some really outlandish things."

Under the new shift in power in the city, would Marion Barry perhaps be accused of corruption if he had tried to do the same? And, would Terry Bishop have been allowed to die, by members of the Control Board, or the Congress? Perhaps we will find our the answer to these questions this winter.—*Dennis Speed*