

such as Henry Kissinger and his accomplices accepts those doctrines of natural law. In his notorious doctoral dissertation at Harvard University, Kissinger pledged his future diplomatic career to follow in the example of the Holy Alliance's Prince Metternich. Kissinger pledged himself to the heritage of the Persian, Roman, Byzantine, Ottoman, Austro-Hungarian, and Russian empires. He rejects absolutely the Judeo-Christian natural law of Western Civilization, and adheres to that evil misconception of man and the universe typified by the slave society of ancient Sparta and the sodomy-ridden abomination that was the empire of Rome. In its own fashion, today's rulers of the Russian Empire also trace their philosophical heritage from Lycurgus's Sparta, and from the models of empire in which one master-race rules as overlord over subjugated races.

The injustice we tolerate against the peoples of black Africa, targetted by the genocidal financial and economic policies of Kissinger and his feudalistic friends, is an act of injustice which savagely violates our own most fundamental moral values. The injustice which our government and major political parties tolerate throughout our nation, as they tolerate the FBI's Gestapo-like frame-up against an innocent U.S. senator, and tolerate murder and drug-pushing in cities like New York, are but an echo of the fact that it is our morality itself which has been shattered by tolerating Henry Kissinger and his accomplices in foreign policy.

Let us go back to being a great industrial power, an agroindustrial power flourishing in scientific and technological progress. Let us be again, what was said of us at the establishment of our independence from the feudalistic policies of Britain: a "temple of liberty" and "beacon of hope" for all mankind. Let us be again the defender of the smaller, weaker nations of the world, against colonialism and imperialism in all their manifestations. Let us build among sovereign nation states a community of principle according to natural law, as Pope Paul VI's *Populorum Progressio* beseeched us to do.

Let the President of the United States be a person who knows that his or her most essential duty is that of the chief magistrate of a great republic. Let the frightened and oppressed in our own and other nations around the earth look up with just hope from their injured circumstances, and say to themselves: "This is an injustice which the President of the United States would not tolerate, if he knew of it." Let that opinion be justified.

Let us, therefore, proceed to expend the needed \$200 billions estimated as required to emplace a first-generation ballistic-missile defense for this nation by the year 1988. That will be not only a physical defense of our republic, but will represent an act by aid of which we return to the principles on which this republic was founded.

Let us move Henry A. Kissinger, and what he represents, for once and forever, out of the policy-making processes of government.

Book Review

The Mussolini world of Gary Hart

by Kathleen Klenetsky

A Different Kind of Presidency

by Theodore C. Sorensen

Harper & Row, 1984

134 pages

\$11.95

Starting in the 1970s, presidential election years have provoked criticisms of the American system of government and provided a platform for discussions of proposals to reform it. Nineteen eighty-four is no exception.

Ted Sorensen, special counsel to President John F. Kennedy and a prominent figure in liberal Democratic politics, has published a scheme for transforming the U.S. government which should be read by anyone who wants to know what lurks behind Gary Hart's blow-dried hairdo. Sorensen signed on with the "new ideas" candidate at approximately the same time his book came out, and it bears a marked resemblance to Hart's presidential platform.

Sorensen argues in his *A Different Kind of Presidency: A Proposal for Breaking the Political Deadlock* that the United States is caught in unprecedented political and economic crises which can only be resolved by "bold new initiatives" and "painful measures." Because these measures—ranging from a unilateral nuclear weapons freeze to economic austerity—will be so "vastly unpopular" with the American people, the government which comes to power through the 1984 elections must be a virtual dictatorship.

Sorensen doesn't use the word dictatorship, of course. He talks instead about "national unity" and "coalition government." "The time has arrived in this country," he writes, "for a temporary, bipartisan, 'grand coalition' of national unity" that would "go beyond anything previously attempted or seriously considered in the United States" and "could change the destiny of the country itself."

This particular "new idea" was aired by the Establishment's top Washington lawyer, Clark Clifford, back during the Watergate era of 1973-74. In fact, the "national unity" dictatorship was the purpose behind the Watergate operation to discredit, not just Richard Nixon, but the presidency itself.

Later, in 1980, Jimmy Carter's White House lawyer Lloyd

Cutler took to the pages of the Council on Foreign Relations' journal, *Foreign Affairs*, to demand that the United States adopt the British parliamentary system, because the era of economic growth was finished, and "political triage" now necessary could not be achieved under the U.S. Constitution. Cutler's proposal was seconded by "conservative" former Treasury Secretary William Simon and "liberal" former Sen. William Fulbright.

Sorensen's idea of "national unity" is that the United States relinquish its sovereignty and submit itself to a one-world dictatorship. As a model for the new system, he specifically invokes the way Third World countries are forced by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) to destroy their economies. "Many governments borrowing from the IMF, including Britain and Italy as well as scores of developing nations, have as a condition for those loans accepted temporary restrictions, some of them vastly unpopular, on their economic conduct. The United States . . . should similarly be able to accept some self-discipline for the common good."

Brave new world

Although Hart has not publicly endorsed his campaign manager's book, there is no question that many of his "new ideas" cohere with what Sorensen proposes. The themes of Sorensen's book—the need for "economic sacrifices," "painful choices," an end to "special interests"—are indistinguishable from Hart's campaign-trail slogans.

Sorensen calls for a wage controls-incomes policy and import fees; these also form basic components of Hart's platform. Among Hart's more radical proposals are plans for a \$10-per-barrel fee on imported oil, taxing consumption, looting employee pension funds, and eliminating 45 million jobs in U.S. basic industry over the next 15 years.

It's difficult to imagine that the American population would accept this voluntarily under normal political conditions. That's where Sorensen's "national unity" dictatorship comes in.

Sorensen strenuously maintains that his proposal lies within the framework of the Constitution; in reality, it stands completely at odds with the intentions of the Founding Fathers, who crafted the American system of government specifically to encourage sustained economic and technological development.

Sorensen's scheme, on the other hand, has been designed to dismantle the U.S. economy. As he candidly notes, no political party or branch of government alone wants to be held responsible "for cutting expansion of or eligibility for the middle-class entitlement programs like Social Security and Medicare, or the funds for repairing our crumbling infrastructure, or the pay or pensions of those who serve in our armed forces" or any of the other austerity schemes which Sorensen suggests, ranging from a wage freeze to higher taxes.

To deal with this inconvenience, Sorensen's proposed

new structure simply excludes the voters. Sorensen stipulates that the Coalition Government will be based on "shared responsibility." The President would be drawn from one party, his Vice-President from the other. So that they are not swayed by accountability to the population, Sorensen specifies that both would have to forswear a second term in office.

In addition, Sorensen proposes that the parties share cabinet and sub-cabinet positions on a 50-50 basis, and that appointments to all other major posts—including Federal Reserve chairman and Joint Chiefs of Staff chairman—be agreed upon by the two parties.

The crux of Sorensen's blueprint is the establishment of two new bodies, a "National Council of Economic Cooperation and Coordination" and a "Council of Elders." They would effectively dictate U.S. government policy in the crucial areas of economic and military-strategic affairs. Both would be instituted by a presidential Executive Order, and both would be composed of *appointed*, not elected, individuals, including former secretaries of state, businessmen, and so forth.

What Sorensen proposes, in effect, is to take such "unbiased, bipartisan" groupings as the Trilateral Commission and the New York Council on Foreign Relations, through which the Establishment families now mobilize to impose their will on government, and *bring them directly into the government itself*.

The book makes it clear that the Council of Economic Cooperation would be the key economic policymaking body in the Coalition Government. According to Sorensen, its most urgent task would be to make "deep reductions" in the federal budget deficit by raising taxes and cutting expenditures. "No one's sacred cow or traditional pork barrel will be safe." The Council will have to "face the painful task of strengthening the tax base and reducing the federal tax deductions and spending programs benefiting every group represented around the table."

Appeasement

Sorensen zeroes in on U.S. defense as a key area in which the Coalition Government could take "bold new initiatives" without having to worry about the American electorate. Forget the constitutional way to make foreign policy; instead, after discussions with Congress and "quiet and informal talks between the two superpowers," the Coalition President should declare a four-year freeze on the production, testing, and deployment of all strategic nuclear weapons, including the MX missile and the B-1 bomber, the production of plutonium, and the testing of anti-satellite and other space weapons.

This blueprint for unilateral disarmament, claims Sorensen—who was forced to withdraw as Jimmy Carter's first choice to head the CIA because he had managed to wangle out of military service during the Korean War—is exactly the kind of "good-will gesture" the United States must make in order to usher in a new era of relations with the Soviet Union.