

1: Download [PDF] Soviet Constitutional Crisis Free Online | New Books in Politics

Soviet Constitutional Crisis and millions of other books are available for Amazon Kindle. Learn more Enter your mobile number or email address below and we'll send you a link to download the free Kindle App.

United States of America. In , there was a constitutional crisis in Russia. Those who opposed Yeltsin claimed that he was attempting to increase executive powers. After some time of debate, conflict and tension, Boris Yeltsin dissolved the Supreme Soviet on September 21st. Using the results of the referendum as justification, he declared that the Supreme Soviet was not following the will of the people, and that by dissolving the Soviet he was clearing the way for reforms that would help the country. The next day, the Supreme Soviet impeached Yeltsin the current constitution did not allow the President to dissolve the Soviet and swore vice president Alexander Rutskoy to the office of President. Over the following days, protests for both Yeltsin and the Soviet took place. Yeltsin cut off water, electricity and phone lines to the White House the Legislative Building. Armed protestors joined the Soviet in the White House. It was at this point when Military, who had remained neutral throughout the crisis so far, decided to join forces with Yeltsin. On October 4th, the military bombarded the white house with tanks. Then, at noon, ground forces stormed the White House and occupied it floor by floor. By the afternoon, all street protests had been put down. According to the Russian Government, people were killed. However, according to unofficial sources, as many as 2, may have died. Yeltsin solidified his power and established the State Duma to replace the Supreme Soviet. Those who had gone against him, including Rutskoy, were later pardoned by the Duma in Now Historians note the fact that the military only grudgingly sided with Yeltsin, and at the last minute. Many Generals within the military sided with the Soviet personally, but decided to side with Yeltsin due to other reasons. However, what if the Generals within the military had decided to side to with Soviet? What if they had done what they believed was right, regardless of the possible outcomes? What if instead of shelling the White House, they had instead shelled the Kremlin? What if the Supreme Soviet defeated Boris Yeltsin?

2: JFK's Forgotten Constitutional Crisis - POLITICO Magazine

Read "Soviet Constitutional Crisis" by Robert Sharlet with Rakuten Kobo. Moving from the adoption of the "post-Stalin" Constitution of through its subsequent implementation under.

On March 3, 1991, on the orders of Stalin, the Chechen-Ingush ASSR was disbanded and its population forcibly deported upon the accusations of collaboration with the invaders and separatism. The status of the southernmost Kurils remains in dispute with Japan. On February 8, 1954, Malenkov was officially demoted to deputy Prime Minister. Early 1990s Main articles: The document, consisting of a preamble and fourteen articles, stated that the Soviet Union ceased to exist as a subject of international law and geopolitical reality. However, based on the historical community of peoples, relations between them, given the bilateral treaties, the desire for a democratic rule of law, the intention to develop their relations based on mutual recognition and respect for state sovereignty, the parties agreed to the formation of the Commonwealth of Independent States. It appears that the RSFSR took the line that it was not possible to secede from an entity that no longer existed. The Soviet Union officially ceased to exist the next day. According to law, during 1991, it was allowed to use the old name of the RSFSR for official business forms, seals and stamps. Russia made a significant turn toward developing a market economy by implanting basic tenets such as market-determined prices. Two fundamental and interdependent goals – macroeconomic stabilization and economic restructuring – the transition from central planning to a market-based economy. The former entailed implementing fiscal and monetary policies that promote economic growth in an environment of stable prices and exchange rates. The latter required establishing the commercial, and institutional entities – banks, private property, and commercial legal codes – that permit the economy to operate efficiently. Opening domestic markets to foreign trade and investment, thus linking the economy with the rest of the world, was an important aid in reaching these goals. The Gorbachev regime failed to address these fundamental goals. By mid-1990s, the results were mixed. The struggle for the center of power in post-Soviet Russia and for the nature of the economic reforms culminated in a political crisis and bloodshed in the fall of 1999. Yeltsin, who represented a course of radical privatization, was opposed by the parliament. Confronted with opposition to the presidential power of decree and threatened with impeachment, he "dissolved" the parliament on September 21, in contravention of the existing constitution, and ordered new elections and a referendum on a new constitution. The parliament then declared Yeltsin deposed and appointed Aleksandr Rutskoy acting president on September 21. Tensions built quickly, and matters came to a head after street riots on October 2–3. On October 4, Yeltsin ordered Special Forces and elite army units to storm the parliament building, the "White House" as it is called. With tanks thrown against the small-arms fire of the parliamentary defenders, the outcome was not in doubt. Rutskoy, Ruslan Khasbulatov, and the other parliamentary supporters surrendered and were immediately arrested and jailed. The official count was dead, wounded with several men killed and wounded on the presidential side. A new post-Soviet constitution, creating a strong presidency, was approved by referendum on December 12, 1993. In February 1994, a separate agreement was reached with Moscow on the status of Tatarstan as an associate state in Russia with confederate status. After the Ukrainian revolution, an internationally disputed referendum and Russian military intervention, Crimea was annexed by Russia in March 2014.

3: Book Talk: Constitutional Democracy in Crisis?, Wednesday, October 3 at noon

The constitutional crisis of was a political stand-off between the Russian president Boris Yeltsin and the Russian parliament that was resolved by using military force. The relations between the president and the parliament had been deteriorating for some time.

Kennedy was visibly uncomfortable with the question. However, without minimizing the numerous foreign policy and defense mistakes JFK made during his thousand days in office, he also distinguished himself during a number of less well-known crises which tested both his powers of judgment, as well as his formidable political skills. And on paper, the B looked great. Strangelove memorably played by George C. Scott, the Valkyrie represented the future of air power at a time when it was increasingly being overshadowed by the ballistic missile. He wanted Bs for his Air Force, so that the aircraft could form an aerial picket line around the Soviet Union. Consequently, in , the Eisenhower administration decided to downgrade the B project to an aerodynamic research project, limiting production to two prototypes, while maintaining the option of upgrading it to a full weapon production system to appease its backers. The following year, Ike went further, scaling back the program to one air frame and refusing to spend the additional monies which Congress allocated to buy more B and B bombers. Ike did not budge. No slouch on military matters himself, the former Allied supreme commander had a constitutional aversion to the sort of saber-rattling White, LeMay and Spaatz engaged in. It was concerns such as these which moved the retiring president and commander in chief to dedicate his farewell address in January to warning the nation about the dangerous consequences of having such a large, self-perpetuating peacetime military establishment. Additionally Kennedy, who wished to step back from the nuclear brink, had an aversion to a weapon that was geared for a first strike, which undoubtedly is how Moscow would have viewed the nuclear-armed battlewagons circling its airspace. Predictably, LeMay, whom Kennedy had promoted to Air Force chief of staff the year before, after cashiering the belligerent Thomas White after the Bay of Pigs disaster, was less than pleased. It would begin in December and be all over by the first of the New Year. In that interval, every major American city would be reduced to rubble. He told her that certain unpopulated areas in the Far West would be the safest. Obviously such antics did not endear the former SAC commander with the Kennedy administration. As far as LeMay was concerned, the ends being prepared for the war that was certain would come justified the means. As McNamara later put it: He thought the West and the U. Therefore he believed we should fight it sooner than later, when he had a greater advantage. Power, SAC commander right. Kennedy arrived for a military briefing at the SAC base in August Getty In the meantime, Kennedy had developed something of an aversion to the cigar-chomping air general himself. Roswell Gilpatric, the deputy secretary of defense, who had the job of escorting the Air Force chief to the White House for his infrequent conferences with the president, recalled what happened when Kennedy and LeMay met. I mean he would be frantic. LeMay would make what Kennedy considered outrageous proposals that bore no relation to the state of affairs in the s. And [JFK] had to sit there. I saw the president right afterwards. He was choleric, just besides himself. Once again, as he had in prior meetings with his commander-in-chief, LeMay wanted to discuss the B, or the RS, RS standing for reconnaissance-strike, as Air Force staff had re-named the endangered bomber in order to persuade their civilian bosses to make it a full weapons system. The president was OK with building the two prototypes the Defense Department had recommended. But whatever the Air Force called the aircraft, there would be no strong Valkyrie picket line. As far as both JFK and his defense secretary were concerned, ballistic missiles could do the job of protecting the nation as well as the manned bomber, if not better, and for more bang for the buck. But while he was worried about the future of air power like LeMay, Vinson also had another motive in pursuing the B fight. Vinson, then a feisty 78, was adamant that Congress and he had that power, and the pugnacious congressman, whose cunning had helped him win many a previous intergovernmental skirmish, was eager to fight the White House over it. Challenging Ike, the universally revered and respected former Supreme Allied Commander, on national security issues had been one thing. The president might be commander-in-chief, yet in order to exercise his powers, or even to subsist, he must have money, which the

Congress alone can provide. Vinson made his position clear: Carl Vinson in his House office in If Vinson managed to force the Kennedy administration to throttle up the Valkyrie, such a recalibration would be difficult, if not impossible. And the Kremlin, which was watching the intergovernmental warfare over the B with interestâ€”and where Khrushchev was also straining to keep a leash on his hard-linersâ€”might well react accordingly. Who could say, after all, that the Russians would wait for the poorly disguised first strike weapon to be produced en masse before deciding to launch such a strike against the U. He was also lividâ€”so much so that he had prepared a public retort of his own. I do not believe that it is the proper exercise of the Congressional responsibilities to prescribe by law the timing and development of a specific weapons system. And so his riposte was pocketed. Meanwhile both the general media and the aviation and science media continued to add their voices to debate. In public both sides stuck to their gunsâ€”and a smash-up between the legislative and executive branches seemed inevitable. On Wednesday, March 14, a week before the climactic vote, McNamara returned to the House and made an impassioned two and a half hour statement before the Vinson committee in which he reiterated his arguments against reviving the Valkyrie. Vinson and his fellow committeemen were unmoved. It was time for JFK to unleash his secret weaponâ€”his charm. On Monday, March 19, , two days before the pivotal vote on the appropriations bill, Vinson received a call from Speaker of the House John McCormack. An appointment was made for 3: At the designated time, Vinson was led into the empty Oval Office. A few minutes later, McNamara arrived, followed by the president. No one knows exactly what Kennedy said to Vinson during their walkabout, but whatever it was, it was enough to get him to formally strike his colors. There would be no collision between Congress and the White House after allâ€”at least not over Valkyrie. The next day, standing proudly in the well of the House, Vinson insisted that he had won. So we can congratulate ourselves. Wisely, Kennedy chose not to rub it in when he was asked about the surprisingly pacific resolution of the B crisis at his next news conference two days later. Can you tell us who won what and from whom? And that, essentially, was the last time Kennedy discussed the B controversy in publicâ€”which helps explain why this Byzantine episode has fallen between the historical cracks. Getty The two prototypes JFK signed off on were ultimately producedâ€”and they did fly, for a time. After making several additional research flights, the surviving Valkyrie was flown to the U. There was blood on the floor! Sander is a journalist and historian. A former Cornell writer in residence, he is the author of several works of non-fiction, including Serling and The Hundred Day Winter War, and is currently working on a book about the Cold War. He is also a contributor to the European edition of Politico. This article tagged under:

4: Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic - Wikipedia

Historical Map of Russia & the former Soviet Union (4 October) - Russian Constitutional Crisis: With the fall of the Soviet Union, Russian president Boris Yeltsin introduced radical economic reforms in an attempt to stave off further collapse.

The president was concerned about the terms of the constitutional amendments passed in late , which meant that his special powers of decree were set to expire by the end of Yeltsin expanded the powers of the presidency beyond normal constitutional limits in carrying out the reform program. Yeltsin, awaiting implementation of his privatization program, demanded that parliament reinstate his decree powers only parliament had the authority to replace or amend the constitution. The course of the President, a course of transformations, or the course of the Congress, the Supreme Soviet and its Chairman, a course towards folding up reforms, and ultimately towards the deepening of the crisis. Early saw increasing tension between Yeltsin and the parliament over the language of the referendum and power sharing. The legislature, marshaled by Speaker Ruslan Khasbulatov , began to sense that it could block and even defeat the president. The tactic that it adopted was gradually to erode presidential control over the government. The president stalked out of the congress. The parliament was gradually expanding its influence over the government. Yeltsin also bitterly attacked the parliament, accusing the deputies of trying to restore the Soviet-era order. Yeltsin conceded that he had made mistakes and reached out to swing voters in parliament. The parliament voted that in order to win, the president would need to obtain 50 percent of the whole electorate, rather than 50 percent of those actually voting, to avoid an early presidential election. This time, the Constitutional Court supported Yeltsin and ruled that the president required only a simple majority on two issues: Yeltsin termed the results a mandate for him to continue in power. Before the referendum, Yeltsin had promised to resign, if the electorate failed to express confidence in his policies. As before, the president had to appeal to the people over the heads of the legislature. On 1 May , antigovernment protests organized by the hardline opposition turned violent. Numerous deputies of the Supreme Soviet took part in organizing the protest and in its course. One OMON police officer suffered fatal injuries during the riot. As a reaction, a number of the representatives of Saint Petersburg intelligentsia e. Of course, the two main drafts contained contrary views of legislative-executive relations. Julyâ€”September[edit] The parliament was active in July, while the president was on vacation, and passed a number of decrees that revised economic policy in order to "end the division of society. The president returned in August and declared that he would deploy all means, including circumventing the constitution, to achieve new parliamentary elections. In July, the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation confirmed the election of Pyotr Sumin to head the administration of the Chelyabinsk oblast , something that Yeltsin had refused to accept. As a result, a situation of dual power existed in that region from July to October in , with two administrations claiming legitimacy simultaneously. In August , a commentator reflected on the situation as follows: A presidential spokesman said that he had been suspended because of "accusations of corruption. Two weeks later Yeltsin declared that he would agree to call early presidential elections provided that the parliament also called elections. The parliament ignored him. This appointment was unacceptable to the Supreme Soviet, which emphatically rejected it. The powers of the President of Russian Federation cannot be used to change the national and state organization of the Russian Federation, to dissolve or to interfere with the functioning of any elected organs of state power. In this case, his powers cease immediately. In his television appearance to the citizens of Russia, President Yeltsin argued for the decree nr as follows: Already more than a year attempts were made to reach a compromise with the corps of deputies, with the Supreme Soviet. Russians know well that how many steps were taken by my side during the last congresses and between them. The majority of the Supreme Soviet goes directly against the will of the Russian people. A course is taken in favour of the weakening of the president and ultimately his removal from office, of the disorganization of the work of the government; during the last months, dozens of antipopular decisions have been prepared and passed. The more flagrant ones are the so-called economic policies of the Supreme Soviet, its decisions on the budget, privatization, there are many others that deepen the crisis, cause colossal damage

to the country. All attempts of the government undertaken to at least somewhat alleviate the economic situation meet incomprehension. There is hardly a day when the cabinet of ministers is not harassed, its hands are not being tied. And this happens in a situation of a deepest economic crisis. The Supreme Soviet has stopped taking into account the decrees of the president, his amendments of the legislative projects, even his constitutional veto rights. Constitutional reform has practically been pared down. The process of creating rule of law in Russia has essentially been disorganized. To the contrary, what is going on is a deliberate reduction of the legal basis of the young Russian state that is even without this weak. The legislative work became a weapon of political struggle. Laws, that Russia urgently needs, are not being passed for years. A cleansing of committees and commissions is taking place. Everyone who does not show up personal loyalty to its leader is being mercilessly expelled from the Supreme Soviet, from its presidium. The power in the Supreme Soviet has been captured by a group of persons who have turned it into an HQ of the intransigent opposition. The constitution currently in force does not allow to do this. The constitution in force also does not provide for a procedure of passing a new constitution, that would provide for a worthy exit from the crisis of state power. I as the guarantor of the security of our state have to propose an exit from this deadlock, have to break this vicious circle. At the same time, Yeltsin repeated his announcement of a constitutional referendum, and new legislative elections for December. He also repudiated the Constitution of , declaring that it had been replaced with one that gave him extraordinary executive powers. According to the new plan, the lower house would have deputies and be called the State Duma , the name of the Russian legislature before the Bolshevik Revolution in The Federation Council , which would bring together representatives from the 89 subdivisions of the Russian Federation, would assume the role of an upper house. Yeltsin claimed that by dissolving the Russian parliament in September he was clearing the tracks for a rapid transition to a functioning market economy. With this pledge, he received strong backing from the leading powers of the West. Yeltsin enjoyed a strong relationship with the Western powers, particularly the United States , but the relationship made him unpopular with some Russians. In Russia, the Yeltsin side had control over television, where hardly any pro-parliament views were expressed during the September–October crisis. The next day, the Constitutional Court held that Yeltsin had violated the constitution and could be impeached. Ruskoy was proclaimed president and took the oath on the constitution. Russia now had two presidents and two ministers of defense, security, and interior. It was dual power in earnest. Although Gennady Zyuganov and other top leaders of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation did not participate in the events, individual members of communist organizations actively supported the parliament. Though only deputies were present the quorum was , Congress purported to impeach Yeltsin. Mass protests and the barricading of the parliament[edit] Yeltsin also sparked popular unrest with his dissolution of a parliament increasingly opposed to his neoliberal economic reforms. Tens of thousands of Russians marched in the streets of Moscow seeking to bolster the parliamentary cause. The demonstrators were protesting against the deteriorating living conditions. Since , the GDP had been declining, corruption was rampant, violent crime was skyrocketing, medical services were collapsing and life expectancy falling. Yeltsin was also increasingly getting the blame. Nonetheless, some of them also tried to voice their protest, and sporadic strikes took place across Russia. The protesters included supporters of various communist Labour Russia and nationalist organizations, including those belonging to the National Salvation Front. Also on the same day, the Interior Ministry moved to seal off the parliament building. Barricades and wire were put around the building. Storming of the television premises[edit] Soviet leaders still did not discount the prospect of a compromise with Yeltsin. The Russian Orthodox Church acted as a host to desultory discussions between representatives of the parliament and the president. Khasbulatov also called for the storming of the Kremlin and imprisoning "the criminal and usurper Yeltsin" in Matrosskaya Tishina. But the pro-parliament crowds were met by Interior Ministry units and special forces who took positions in and around the TV complex. A pitched battle followed. Part of the TV center was significantly damaged. Television stations went off the air and 62 people were killed, including Terry Michael Duncan , an American lawyer, who was in Moscow to establish a law firm and was killed while attempting to help the wounded. When broadcasting resumed late in the evening, vice-premier Yegor Gaidar called on television for a meeting in support of democracy and President Yeltsin "so that the country would not be turned yet again

into a huge concentration camp" [41]. A number of people with different political convictions and interpretations over the causes of the crisis such as Grigory Yavlinsky , Alexander Yakovlev , Yuri Luzhkov , Ales Adamovich , and Bulat Okudzhava also appealed to support the President. The Ostankino killings went unreported by Russian state television. Two French, one British and one American journalist were killed by sniper fire during the massacre. By this time dozens of people had been killed and hundreds had been wounded. Ruskoy, as a former general, appealed to some of his ex-colleagues. After all, many officers and especially rank-and-file soldiers had little sympathy for Yeltsin. But the supporters of the parliament did not send any emissaries to the barracks to recruit lower-ranking officer corps, making the fatal mistake of attempting to deliberate only among high-ranking military officials who already had close ties to parliamentary leaders. In the end, a prevailing bulk of the generals did not want to take their chances with a Ruskoy-Khasbulatov regime. The plan of action was proposed by Captain Gennady Zakharov. Ten tanks were to fire at the upper floors of the White House , with the aim of minimizing casualties but creating confusion and panic amongst the defenders. Then, special troops of the Vypel and Alpha units would storm the building. Those, who went against the peaceful city and unleashed bloody slaughter, are criminals. But this is not only a crime of individual bandits and pogrommakers. Everything that took place and is still taking place in Moscow is a pre-planned armed rebellion. It has been organized by Communist revanchists , Fascist leaders, a part of former deputies, the representatives of the Soviets. Under the cover of negotiations they gathered forces, recruited bandit troops of mercenaries, who were accustomed to murders and violence.

5: Who Was Who? The Key Players In Russia's Dramatic October Showdown

Soviet Constitutional Crisis (CONTEMPORARY SOVIET/POST-SOVIET POLITICS) - Kindle edition by Robert Sharlet. Download it once and read it on your Kindle device, PC, phones or tablets.

The much-amended and fatally outdated Soviet Constitution offered no way out of the mounting standoff. Yeltsin ordered the disbanding of the parliament, the Supreme Soviet, on September 21 and called for new elections. The country fell into a dangerous dual-power situation. Yeltsin responded by isolating the building, surrounding it with police and cutting off electricity, telephones, and water. In the late s, Boris Yeltsin transformed himself from regional Communist Party boss to populist firebrand. This metamorphosis climaxed with the iconic image of Yeltsin standing on a tank and facing down a hard-line coup in front of the Moscow White House in August -- which precipitated the breakup of the Soviet Union and catapulted Yeltsin into the Kremlin. But by the spring of , the luster of those heady days was wearing thin. In a compromise move, Yeltsin nominated former Gazprom head Viktor Chernomyrdin instead and he was confirmed in December. Yeltsin performed well in an April referendum on his rule. But as the summer wore on, he found himself increasingly in conflict with the Supreme Soviet, its speaker, Ruslan Khasbulatov, and his own vice president, Aleksandr Rutskoi. With gridlock and confrontation paralyzing the country, Yeltsin on September 21, , signed Decree No. Yeltsin based his decree on the fact that nearly two-thirds of Russians in the April referendum had voted in favor of immediate parliamentary elections. The president claimed the move was necessary to carry out needed economic reforms, establish a market economy, and prevent a return to the Soviet past. When legislators barricaded themselves in the Moscow White House and impeached Yeltsin, he ignored them and cut off electricity, phone service, and hot water to the building. Clashes broke out between police and anti-Yeltsin protesters, who set up barricades in the capital. By midday, troops loyal to Yeltsin had managed to secure the building and arrest the rebel lawmakers. Three months later, a new constitution was approved in a national referendum, giving the president enormous powers that the office maintains to this day. Yeltsin won a second term as president in a controversial election in . His health had deteriorated, and the Kremlin became embroiled in a series of corruption scandals. Yeltsin died in . Confidence between each other was completely lost. And most importantly, there was strong interference in the efforts to carry out economic reforms. We all had that Soviet, imperial mentality, where strength will always better solve the problem as opposed to negotiations and compromise. It was a sickness of Yeltsin, it was a sickness of [former Soviet leader Mikhail] Gorbachev -- it was a sickness we all had. After the Soviet breakup, Khasbulatov was elected speaker of the Supreme Soviet, where he quickly consolidated power. This quickly escalated into a bitter power struggle between the two men and their supporters. In September , Khasbulatov publicly denounced the president as an alcoholic and called for his resignation. Addressing supporters from the balcony of the White House, Khasbulatov urged them to storm the Kremlin and imprison "the criminal usurper Yeltsin. In , the newly elected parliament, the State Duma, amnestied him and other leaders of the anti-Yeltsin resistance. But before that, the executive branch had devised a plot to overthrow the existing political system. On September 21, they began implementing that plot through a military coup. Need I remind you what the Constitutional Court decided? This should be the subject of a new parliamentary investigation. We need a new commission to investigate it, without any haste, and bring this issue to a close. Nobody has any power in our country except the president. And that is a direct consequence of what happened back then. And like Khasbulatov, he fell out with Yeltsin and his team after the Soviet collapse. He was particularly critical of the team of young economists, including Yegor Gaidar and Anatoly Chubais, whom Yeltsin tapped to spearhead his economic reforms. Beginning in late , Rutskoi began accusing Yeltsin and his entourage of corruption. As head of a state anticorruption council, Rutskoi famously claimed to have "suitcases of kompromat," or incriminating materials, on them. In September , after Yeltsin evicted Rutskoi from his Kremlin office and had the door sealed, Khasbulatov gave him space in the parliament building. After Yeltsin dissolved parliament and the rebel lawmakers voted to impeach him, Rutskoi was sworn in as "acting president. Rutskoi was arrested together with Khasbulatov and other leaders of the rebellion and charged with inciting mass disturbances. He

was freed in an amnesty the following year. Rutskoi formed a nationalist political party, Derzhava, and in was elected governor of Kursk Oblast, serving until He has since left public life. But in the past two years, the seeds of truth have begun to sprout. I strongly support this for two reasons: I wanted just one thing: Tragically, I was right -- this was the consequence of the privatization: The impoverishment of the population was total -- we lost our industrial, agricultural, and military capacities. The legislature repeatedly refused to confirm him as prime minister over the summer of , producing the most visible symbol of the split between the two branches of government. In December , as part of a bid to reach a compromise with the Supreme Soviet, Yeltsin nominated former Gazprom head Viktor Chernomyrdin as premier and he was confirmed. Gaidar continued as a leading economic adviser to the government. In September , in what was seen as a deliberate snub of the legislature, Gaidar was appointed first deputy prime minister overseeing economic policy. Gaidar resigned from government in and returned to academic life. He remains widely reviled among the Russian public. He died in at the age of He maintained ties with the radical, anti-Semitic Pamyat movement and openly called himself a Stalinist. He organized numerous mass demonstrations against Yeltsin in the period. On October 3, Anpilov led his supporters to a mass demonstration outside the besieged parliament building. About 2, supporters showed up and broke through the barricades and into the area around the White House. Anpilov was arrested with the other leaders of the uprising on October 7 and was pardoned by the Duma in February He continued to participate in radical leftist politics until his death in January at the age of As a career soldier, Defense Minister Pavel Grachev rose through the military ranks and became head of the Soviet paratroopers in He backed Yeltsin during the thwarted hard-line coup of August and, according to some press reports, even warned him of the plot ahead of time. And Yeltsin rewarded him handsomely. After the Soviet breakup, Grachev enjoyed a meteoric rise, becoming defense minister in May As the constitutional crisis of unfolded, Grachev again demonstrated his loyalty to Yeltsin, ordering his troops to shell and storm the White House. Footage taken at the time showed Grachev praising his troops for saving Russia from a civil war. In the halls of power, Grachev also became part of the so-called party of war, a group of advisers -- including presidential security chief Aleksandr Korzhakov, Federal Security Service FSB chief Mikhail Barsukov, and First Deputy Prime Minister Oleg Soskovets -- who reportedly persuaded Yeltsin to launch his disastrous military campaign in breakaway Chechnya in Grachev was fired in July , shortly after Yeltsin won a second term in the Kremlin, in a move seen at the time as a purge of Kremlin hard-liners. Grachev died in September at the age of Interior Minister Viktor Yerin was a career police officer, a veteran of the Afghan war, and a Yeltsin loyalist. On October 1, in the midst of the standoff, Yeltsin promoted him to the rank of general and, afterward, awarded him with the title "Hero of the Russian Federation. He died in March at the age of And as Yeltsin ascended in the perestroika-era democratic movement, Korzhakov was by his side. When Yeltsin got to the Kremlin, Korzhakov became head of the powerful Presidential Guard Service, wielding enormous behind-the-scenes influence. Some observers say it was Korzhakov who ultimately convinced Yeltsin to shell and storm the White House. Together with Grachev, he reportedly persuaded Yeltsin to send troops to breakaway Chechnya in Korzhakov was fired in July In , he published a memoir of his Kremlin years, titled Boris Yeltsin: He wrote that Yeltsin, before the October events, ordered him to prepare a plan to arrest all the members of the Supreme Soviet if they passed an impeachment resolution against the president. He served as a deputy in the State Duma as an independent representative from Tula from to Khorzakov is currently retired and reportedly working on another volume of memoirs. Terry Duncan Terry Duncan, known by his middle name Mike, was an American lawyer who went out to the Ostankino firefight out of curiosity. When fighting broke out and snipers began shooting into the crowd and at journalists, Duncan, 26, began helping wounded victims. Duncan was eventually shot in the head and killed during the firefight. He had been in Moscow just a few months, working to set up a new law firm with a partner, Jamison Firestone. The firm they created, Firestone Duncan, later had another brush with tragedy in Russia. A previous version of this story was published on October 3,

6: Constitution of Russia - Wikipedia

SOVIET CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS Download *Soviet Constitutional Crisis* ebook PDF or Read Online books in PDF, EPUB, and Mobi Format. Click Download or Read Online button to *SOVIET CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS* book pdf for free now.

Tanks near the burned Russian parliament building. Throughout , Yeltsin fought the Supreme Soviet over the increasingly unpopular reforms as well as broader questions of control over policy. Yeltsin simultaneously called for a referendum to take four questions on presidential authority and national policy to the Russian people. After a few days of negotiations, Yeltsin and parliament speaker Ruslan Khasbulatov agreed that Yeltsin could rule by decree until an April popular vote. Though Yeltsin would win the referendum, his new popular mandate did little to resolve the escalating dispute with the Supreme Soviet, which retained strong constitutional powers. The parliament responded by impeaching Yeltsin and installing Vice President Alexander Rutskoy as acting president. Russia entered a full-blown constitutional and political crisis accompanied by protests and violence. A week later, Yeltsin ordered internal security forces to surround the parliament. Following intense violence on Oct. Khasbulatov and Rutskoy would go to prison, though Yeltsin later forgave Rutskoy sufficiently to appoint him as the governor of Kursk, in western Russia. These eventsâ€”from January through October â€”had transformative consequences for Russia and for its relationship with the United States and the West. First, and most important, the victorious Yeltsin resolved never again to be weaker than a defiant parliament. At the end of , upon resigning before the end of this term, Yeltsin would hand his new and far more powerful office to then-prime minister Vladimir Putin. Had Putin assumed weaker presidential powers, with more checks and balances, after his election in , Russia would be a different country today. This would include controversial privatization decisions that rewarded political allies and established competing clans of corrupt senior officials and newly minted tycoons. Unrestrained competition among these groups would extend from wars of words among the television channels and newspapers they controlled to gun battles on the streets of Moscow and provincial capitals. More important, however, is that, at the time, many Russians predictably drew the conclusion that America supported Yeltsin, his reforms and his generally acquiescent foreign policy more than it supported democracy in Russia. Ironically, this conclusion was especially widespread among intellectual elites who unlike most others had a better understanding of what democracy really meant. Ordinary Russians, who had little basis to understand democratic practices, seemed to see democracy less as a set of principles, structures or procedures and more as a means to an end, with the end being prosperity both nationally and personally. In that context, U. Some former Clinton administration officials have argued that the United States had no practical alternative to supporting Yeltsin, largely by suggesting that the Supreme Soviet was less legitimate than Yeltsin or that its policies would have been more damaging to U. Neither point was persuasive at the time and neither has become more persuasive since. This political mandate could have helped Yeltsin win a compromise closer to his terms, but was insufficient for him to demand total surrender from his parliamentary opponents. Had they succeeded, Russia could have a parliamentary system much less amenable to authoritarianism and might have managed a smoother economic transition that avoided the excesses of the s. Had they failed, Khasbulatov and his unimpressive allies in the Supreme Soviet would have discredited themselves but need not have discredited the United States too. And Russia might still have a parliamentary system with stronger checks and balances. As Talbott writes, on Oct. Russians and Americans are still living with the results.

7: Soviet constitutional crisis : from De-Stalinization to disintegration in SearchWorks catalog

The constitutional crisis of was a political stand-off between the Russian president and the Russian parliament that was resolved by using military force. The relations between the president and the parliament had been deteriorating for some time.

The report on the constitutional crisis in Russia that you are about to read is unique for a number of reasons. All three are prominent constitutional law experts who have published extensively both in Russia and abroad. Elena Lukyanova has been practicing law for two decades as a defense attorney and therefore has firsthand operational knowledge of and experience with the Russian system of criminal justice. Ilya Shablinsky is a member of the Presidential Council for Development of Civil Society and Human Rights, for which he works on a variety of issues, including freedom of information, the rights of journalists, and penitentiary system reform. Vladimir Pastukhov holds doctorates in political science and law, and he combines both legal and political analyses in his research. The second unique feature of this report is the quality and depth of its analysis. The report explicitly details how counter-reforms have distorted various components of the constitutional order, and it highlights the signs of a constitutional crisis that are evident in the current form of government, political regime, and state structure. The report paints a terrifying picture of the degradation of fundamental governmental institutions and the ensuing imbalance of state powers. For instance, the Russian Parliament has morphed into a Soviet-like institution, with no place left for political discussion, and the repressive role of the courts remains mostly unchanged since Soviet times. The third unique feature of the report has to do with its analytical approach, which applies the principle of path dependence to the Russian constitutional crisis. In understanding the current constitutional crisis, history matters, as some of the current problems Russia faces are rooted in the circumstances surrounding the drafting of the Russian Constitution in the early s. Subsequent issues with the implementation of the Russian Constitution arose as a result of specific features of the semi-“presidential constitutional system envisaged in the fundamental law of Russia. The final reason for reading the report has to do with its constructive nature. Their suggestions are both well founded and feasible, raising the hope that they will eventually be heard. A word from the authors Russia is at a constitutional turning point. The outcome of this moment-“an anti-constitutional coup or the beginning of a long effort aimed at the restoration of constitutional freedoms and principles that have been gradually usurped for 15 years by reactionary reforms, which have one by one eroded the democratic essence of the Russian Constitution-“depends upon the people. Today, everything points to the willingness of the authorities to use foreign and domestic challenges-“some of them real, others of their own making-“to eradicate any remaining sense from the Constitution. There is every indication that an anti-constitutional coup is already in process. In Russia, power is being concentrated in the hands of unconstitutional authorities that have taken the place of constitutional institutions. Russia does not know by whom it is governed, let alone who controls these people. Its only function is to legitimize the decisions made by the president and his inner circle. All of these signs are evidence of a gathering constitutional crisis, one of the deepest to strike Russia in its history. The constitutional crisis that faces us today must and can be overcome by restoring the democratic essence of the Russian Constitution through a radical but balanced and gradual reform aiming at the restoration of constitutional order in Russia. The Russian public will need to make the decision to embrace such reform in the near future; and it has to be ready to do so. We dream of a strong and prosperous Russia, and we understand that in the modern world, Russia can be strong and prosperous only if it becomes a constitutional state, governed by the rule of law. It took over one hundred tragic years during which the Russian people suffered enormous losses, for this truth to be realized. The current generation needs to make sure that these losses were not in vain.

8: Russian constitutional crisis - Wikipedia

In , there was a constitutional crisis in Russia. President Boris Yeltsin had been in conflict with the Supreme Soviet of Russia over his reforms.

Edited by Mark A. John Garwood and W. Huq is the Frank and Bernice J. Louis and the Sir Y. Percival is the Robert F. Smith is the Christopher H. Graber, Sanford Levinson, and Mark Tushnet Reviews and Awards "Many are convinced that liberal constitutional democracy is in the midst of a severe crisis, and is being replaced by illiberal constitutional democracy. This important book analyses the reasons for this development, both at the global level and at the national level. The time is right for this book to be published by its first-class authors, and it provides the intellectual foundations necessary for each of us to cope with the changes that are occurring in our own constitutional democracies, and to try to turn the tide. For me, as a retired judge, the book provides food for thought about where we went wrong, and what we can do to take us in a new direction. Globally, political freedoms are becoming weaker. Democracy does not necessarily guarantee prosperity. Those who wish to learn about what is happening to constitutional democracies around the world should read this groundbreaking, multiperspective, and transdisciplinary book. Fortunately, we now have the exquisitely crafted chapters in this unique collection of essays to help us make sense of our current predicament. Written against the backdrop of a multitude of ominous developments that have shaken confidence in the stability and endurance of liberal democratic institutions, the contributors to this timely volume explore this portentous moment from all angles, leaving the reader richly informed, if not sanguine, about future prospects. A careful reading will, however, not end in despair, for as the most disturbing threats to political freedom and economic justice emanate from within, the challenge that they represent can also be met from within. Malcolm Macdonald Professor of Constitutional and Comparative Law, University of Texas at Austin "This book is an indispensable resource for understanding the rise of illiberal populisms and the possibilities for sustaining constitutionalism and democracy. Contributors include leading global scholars of comparative constitutional law, whose chapters provide a diverse empirical base from countries around the world with which to evaluate constitutional democracy and its contemporary challenges and competitors. Theories are tested, data provided, and new concepts advanced - addressing, among other topics, the role of political parties, political leaders, religion, economic inequality, race, ethnicity, and immigration - in a set of readable and relatively short chapters that, as much as any edited scholarly collection could be, is a true "page-turner", hard to stop reading once one starts. Jackson, Thurgood Marshall Professor of Constitutional Law, Harvard Law School "This rigorous, wide-ranging, and engaging volume is an indispensable guide to the current crisis of constitutional democracy. Its high quality empirical chapters help us understand the global reach and historical roots of the current crisis. This is a landmark book for our troubled times. Mehta, Vice-Chancellor, Ashoka University; past President, Centre for Policy Research "At the end of the 20th century, constitutional democracy had gained almost universal acceptance. At least, so it seemed. A decade later, we see constitutional democracy declining or mutating into more authoritarian forms of government in a number of countries. In this timely book, more than forty outstanding authors from many parts of the world offer a comprehensive analysis of this development and its causes, which should be of paramount interest not only to scholars and students of law and politics, but to everyone concerned about public affairs.

9: Constitutional Crisis in Russia and How to Resolve It - Institute of Modern Russia

The constitutional crisis reached a tipping point on September 21, 1993, when President Boris Yeltsin aimed to dissolve the country's legislature (the Congress of People's Deputies and its Supreme Soviet), although the president did not have the power to dissolve the parliament according to the constitution.

The president was concerned about the terms of the constitutional amendments passed in late 1993, which meant that his special powers of decree were set to expire by the end of Yeltsin's term. Yeltsin expanded the powers of the presidency beyond normal constitutional limits in carrying out the reform program. Yeltsin, awaiting implementation of his privatization program, demanded that parliament reinstate his decree powers only if parliament had the authority to replace or amend the constitution. The course of the President, a course of transformations, or the course of the Congress, the Supreme Soviet and its Chairman, a course towards folding up reforms, and ultimately towards the deepening of the crisis. Early 1993 saw increasing tension between Yeltsin and the parliament over the language of the referendum and power sharing. The legislature, marshaled by Speaker Ruslan Khasbulatov, began to sense that it could block and even defeat the president. The tactic that it adopted was gradually to erode presidential control over the government. The president stalked out of the congress. The parliament was gradually expanding its influence over the government. Yeltsin also bitterly attacked the parliament, accusing the deputies of trying to restore the Soviet-era order. Yeltsin conceded that he had made mistakes and reached out to swing voters in parliament. National referendum

Main article: The parliament voted that in order to win, the president would need to obtain 50 percent of the whole electorate, rather than 50 percent of those actually voting, to avoid an early presidential election. This time, the Constitutional Court supported Yeltsin and ruled that the president required only a simple majority on two issues: Yeltsin termed the results a mandate for him to continue in power. Before the referendum, Yeltsin had promised to resign, if the electorate failed to express confidence in his policies. As before, the president had to appeal to the people over the heads of the legislature. On 1 May 1993, antigovernment protests organized by the hardline opposition turned violent. Numerous deputies of the Supreme Soviet took part in organizing the protest and in its course. One OMON militiaman suffered fatal injuries during the riot. As a reaction, a number of the representatives of Saint Petersburg intelligentsia e. Of course, the two main drafts contained contrary views of legislative-executive relations. Developments in July–September

Edit The parliament was active in July, while the president was on vacation, and passed a number of decrees that revised economic policy in order to "end the division of society. The president returned in August and declared that he would deploy all means, including circumventing the constitution, to achieve new parliamentary elections. In July, the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation confirmed the election of Pyotr Sumin to head the administration of the Chelyabinsk oblast, something that Yeltsin had refused to accept. As a result, a situation of dual power existed in that region from July to October 1993, with two administrations claiming legitimacy simultaneously. As a result, popularly elected President Vasily Guslyannikov member of the pro-Yeltsin Democratic Russia movement lost his position. In August 1993, a commentator reflected on the situation as follows: A presidential spokesman said that he had been suspended because of "accusations of corruption. Two weeks later Yeltsin declared that he would agree to call early presidential elections provided that the parliament also called elections. The parliament ignored him. This appointment was unacceptable to the Supreme Soviet, which emphatically rejected it. Siege and assault

File: Supreme Soviet of Russia meeting

The powers of the President of Russian Federation cannot be used to change national and state organization of Russian Federation, to dissolve or to interfere with the functioning of any elected organs of state power. In this case, his powers cease immediately. At the same time, Yeltsin repeated his announcement of a constitutional referendum, and new legislative elections for December. He also repudiated the Constitution of 1993, declaring that it had been replaced with one that gave him extraordinary executive powers. According to the new plan, the lower house would have deputies and be called the State Duma, the name of the Russian legislature before the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917. The Federation Council, which would bring together representatives from the 89 subdivisions of the Russian Federation, would assume the role of an upper house. Yeltsin claimed that by

dissolving the Russian parliament in September he was clearing the tracks for a rapid transition to a functioning market economy. With this pledge, he received strong backing from the leading powers of the West. Yeltsin enjoyed a strong relationship with Western powers, particularly the United States, but the relationship made him unpopular with some Russians. In Russia, the Yeltsin side had control over television, where hardly any pro-parliament views were expressed during the September–October crisis. The next day, the Constitutional Court held that Yeltsin had violated the constitution and could be impeached. Rutskoy was proclaimed president and took the oath on the constitution. Russia now had two presidents and two ministers of defense, security, and interior. It was dual power in earnest. Although Gennady Zyuganov and other top leaders of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation did not participate in the events, individual members of communist organizations actively supported the parliament. Though only deputies were present the quorum was, Yeltsin was impeached by the Congress. Mass protests and the barricading of the parliament Edit Yeltsin also sparked popular unrest with his dissolution of a parliament increasingly opposed to his neoliberal economic reforms. Tens of thousands of Russians marched in the streets of Moscow seeking to bolster the parliamentary cause. The demonstrators were protesting against the deteriorating living conditions. Since, the GDP had been declining, corruption was rampant, violent crime was skyrocketing, medical services were collapsing and life expectancy falling. Yeltsin was also increasingly getting the blame. Nonetheless, some of them also tried to voice their protest, and even sporadic strikes took place across Russia. The protestors included supporters of various communist Labour Russia and nationalist organizations, including those belonging to the National Salvation Front. Also on the same day, the Interior Ministry moved to seal off the parliament building. Barricades and wire were put around the building. Storming of the television premises Edit The leaders of parliament were still not discounting the prospects of a compromise with Yeltsin. The Russian Orthodox Church acted as a host to desultory discussions between representatives of the parliament and the president. Khasbulatov also called for the storming of the Kremlin and imprisoning "the criminal and usurper Yeltsin" in Matrosskaya Tishina. But the pro-parliament crowds were met at the television complex by Interior Ministry units. A pitched battle followed. Part of the TV center was significantly damaged. Television stations went off the air and 62 people were killed, including Terry Michael Duncan, an American lawyer, who was in Moscow to establish a law firm and was killed while attempting to help the wounded. When broadcasting resumed late in the evening, Yegor Gaidar called on television for a meeting in support of President Yeltsin. A number of people with different political convictions and interpretations over the causes of the crisis such as Grigory Yavlinsky.

Gods voice crying to the inhabitants of Weymouth, and the neighbouring towns A series of essays Letters from a living dead man Controlling the proliferation of nuclear knowledge : an introduction The theory practice of poster art Richard L. Andrews, administrator of M. H. Battle, deceased. A mental health coalition evaluation report Pt. 1. Testimony taken relative to election in Leon, Monroe, Manatee, Hamilton, Duval, Alachua, Clay, and Fly Fishing Boston Injustice for all scott pratt Themistius and the Imperial Court Java by yashwant kanetkar The repetitive strain injury recovery book Drugs and Human Lactation At Nursery School Mathematical methods for physicists arfken 7th Dark knight dynasty Internal Landscape Water and wastewater treatment handbook Between Hashemites and Zionists Henry, Lord Brougham State of the masses Management Principles for Health Care Professionals I Will Dip You in the Sky Expansion in the wake of Parkers Gore East : the Interconnect Project, the Woodward Reservoir, and the Re Lao Peoples Democratic Republic Avanquest expert 9 business edition review Ragtime in unfamiliar bars Great scientific experiments The Valuelessness of Knowledge Labors search for political order Hints For Coin Collectors The 2007-2012 Outlook for Natural Gas Vehicles in the United States Historians in public Invasion the Suit 1 Digest (Virtual Comics the Suit) V. 6. Chloramine-T, hydrogen peroxide, polyphosphoric acid. Parliamentary Debates, House of Lords, Bound Volumes 1994-95 Penguins by Jane P. Resnick Canonical analysis and factor comparison Statistical model validation techniques