

know generally respecting both the development of societies, and of individuals within those cultures. We are able to adduce exemplary evidence of the role of the induced replication of discoveries of principle in infants and later development, as among late adolescents and adults. We can show, in a sufficient sampling of situations, that cultural determination of individual cognitive development is the crucial characteristic of the individual in a degree that has virtually nothing to do with genetic heritage as such.

We can demonstrate, that the primary determinant of human potential lies in those factors of development which either hinder or promote cognitive development of the personality.

Personally, I have accumulated remembered observations to this effect since pre-school childhood. I can compare my own exceptional development of today, to the outcome thus far of the lives of many among the peers I have known. I recall vividly, where many took the downward path, and for what expressed motives, how many others did march upward, but, how, even among the latter, many halted their upward development at a certain turning-point in their careers or simply personal life. This is what attracted my attention in the study

of neurotic disruption of creative potential, by the late Dr. Lawrence Kubie; I do not concur with the psychoanalytical standpoint, which I think essentially childish, and often corrosive in its effects on the moral as well as general intellectual development of the individual. Psychoanalysis acquires this from its essentially self-destructive quality of philosophical immaturity, but Kubie was, at least, pointing in the right direction on that point.

It is only when we begin to shift emphasis from the pathological standpoint inherent in modern sociology, to emphasize the essentially cognitive quality of human nature, that we can speak intelligently of the role of society in the development of the individual.

In conclusion, the essential point is, that it is the successive transformations of a manifold of accumulated discoveries of universal physical principle, on which attention must be focussed, if we are to define the nature of the human species. If there is a process of genetic transformation which is characteristic of living species in general, the genetic quality of development of the act of discovery of valid universal physical principles, defines the nature of man, and the relative quality of both the individual person and his, or her society.

'Faith-Based' Scam To Replace Welfare?

by Marianna Wertz

At a Washington, D.C. conference on Sept. 5-6, the Bush Administration fired the latest round in its war on America's poor and minorities, outlining the content of its proposed Phase II of "welfare reform." The 1996 Federal welfare "reform" policy, the misnamed Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA), comes up for Congressional reauthorization next year.

The conference, convened by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), announced that the Bush Administration's priority would be to "broaden the focus" of state welfare policies, beyond getting a job, to find ways to "foster marriage, abstinence and responsible fatherhood." Put in charge of this offensive will be HHS Secretary Tommy G. Thompson, former governor of Wisconsin, whose Wisconsin Works (W-2) program had pioneered the most brutal welfare cuts in the nation.

The mechanism through which these changes will be implemented, the conference made clear, is Bush's "Faith-Based Initiative," dubbed "state-run prostitution" by Lyndon LaRouche. Bush created the Faith-Based Initiative as one of his first acts in office. On Jan. 29, 2001, he signed Executive

Order 13198, which created Centers for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives in five cabinet departments—Health and Human Services, Housing and Urban Development, Education, Labor, and Justice—all dealing with areas pertinent to welfare policy.

In fact, the 1996 welfare reform legislation, which was part of the Newt Gingrich fascist "Conservative Revolution," and was denounced at the time by LaRouche as a slave-labor bill, already contained a "charitable choice" provision, allowing for "faith-based initiatives" to run the welfare-to-work programs, but the Clinton Administration never fully implemented it. Now, with a complicit Democratic leadership under the thumb of Sen. Joseph Lieberman (D-Conn.), Bush and his pals are preparing to toss what is left of the nation's safety net for the poor, to the paid-for dogs of the "religious community."

Safety Net Slashed

As indicated by the accompanying interviews with former HHS Assistant Secretary Dr. Peter Edelman and Nevada State Sen. Joseph M. Neal, Jr., Bush's Faith-Based Initiative is nothing but "smoke and mirrors," and can in no way take care of the mounting number of poor in this nation, including millions of women and children who have no jobs, no funds, and no place to call home. Throwing "abstinence" and "responsible fatherhood" at people who are on the human trash heap calls to mind Marie Antoinette's dictum to the starving of pre-revolutionary France. Only this time, it's "Let them eat faith."

Dr. Edelman, who quit the Clinton Administration in 1996

when Clinton signed PRWORA, penned an angry letter to the *Washington Post* in February of this year, responding to a commentary by Rebecca Blank and Ron Haskins, which claimed that none of the problems predicted by critics of the 1996 welfare law has materialized. "This is like trivializing an earthquake because it didn't kill as many people as expected," Edelman wrote.

In fact, he continued, "research shows that about 40% of the 2.5-plus million women who have gone off welfare [since 1996] have neither a job nor cash assistance. This means that more than a million women, who have more than 2 million children, are in a precarious position. Many have moved in with extended families, although those arrangements are often unstable and will be jeopardized whenever a recession reduces the income stream coming into those households. And significant numbers have been unable to cope. Homeless shelters all over the country are bursting at the seams."

In February, Edelman concluded his letter with the following: "That it has not been worse is the result of our increased prosperity." Today, that prosperity is but a distant memory, and the situation is indeed getting much worse.

A major earthquake now confronting already financially strapped states, is the Federally imposed five-year lifetime limit for cash assistance on the welfare program, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF). PROWORA specified that all Federal funds for cash assistance would be cut off to individuals after they have been on the welfare rolls for five years.

According to the D.C.-based State Policy Documentation Project, in 16 states which adopted a shorter time limit than the Federal five-year plan, that time limit was over prior to January 2000. In four states, it expired in 2000. In 29 states, the Federal five-year limit expires this year or next. In only two states, is there no time limit under state law.

So, for instance, in Pennsylvania, 12,000 families will be without cash assistance in March 2002, with no provision in place for caring for them. In Louisiana, which imposed a welfare limit of two years in every five, layoffs are now hitting thousands of low-wage workers who have already used up their two-year limit.

The *Wall Street Journal* warned on Sept. 10 that the new, record round of layoffs hitting the U.S. economy this Summer, is striking the low end of the labor force—low-skilled workers and minorities. These workers, many just off the welfare rolls, have not worked long enough to qualify for unemployment insurance (which requires applicants to have worked at least six months of a year—earnings in the last three to six months do not count in computing the unemployment benefit).

With no unemployment insurance, and no cash assistance from TANF, what is to happen to millions of Americans when the full force of the onrushing depression hits? Franklin Roosevelt's welfare policy was created for just such a circumstance. Do Bush and his new army of faith-based prostitutes have any plan? Or do they just have "faith" in money?

Interview: Peter Edelman

Faith-Based Initiative Won't Solve The Problem

Dr. Peter Edelman, a professor at Georgetown University Law Center in Washington, D.C., was an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services during the first Clinton Administration. He resigned from that position in 1996, in protest of President Clinton's signing of the welfare reform legislation, the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA). Dr. Edelman spoke with Marianna Wertz on Sept. 10.

EIR: I'm preparing an article on the reauthorization of the welfare bill, the status of states where the five years are running out, and the relationship between welfare reform and the Faith-Based Initiative. What is your view on these issues?

Edelman: My concern about the Faith-Based Initiative, apart from constitutional questions, which I think are serious, and apart from the fact that it's actually not clear whether there's any substance to it—he didn't really work very hard to get it included in his big tax bill, for example—but my concern in relation to welfare and poverty is the implication that it's a magic wand.

EIR: States are coming to a five-year limit on cash grants for welfare recipients. If the Faith-Based Initiative comes in, and Federal welfare grants end, then money which would normally have come from the Federal government to be funnelled through state institutions to help people survive, will that now go through any church that lines up for the money?

Edelman: But, that's actually too substantive a way to look at it. I think it's more smoke and mirrors, and that what you have here is the rhetoric of a faith-based initiative that is offered as a magic-wand substitute for the substance of an anti-poverty policy. Even if you had a serious faith-based initiative, which I believe this is not, it clearly doesn't substitute for things that you can't accomplish through that set of institutions. You can't get national health coverage through a faith-based initiative. So, I think the Faith-Based Initiative is very cosmetic and, among other things, represents a false promise.

EIR: Is the initiative already acting in that fashion?

Edelman: Well, rhetorically, politically, yes.

EIR: But there's no real substance to it?

Edelman: No, and, as I say, even if it had real substance, it still couldn't possibly do the job.