

Will 'Project Democracy' destroy the Constitution?

by Kathleen Klenetsky

The fundamental issue at stake in the so-called Irangate scandal, is the survival of the U.S. Constitution, and with it, the American republic. Events during the month of May made it inescapably clear that, if the invisible government, which has grossly perverted American foreign policy since the end of World War II through such bizarre and suicidal ventures as the Iran-Contra policy, is not immediately brought to heel, the United States will cease to exist as a government by law.

Since the beginning of May, one Supreme Court justice, Thurgood Marshall, publicly described the Constitution as "defective"; the White House Chief of Staff called for major changes in the Constitution; and Robert McFarlane, a key Irangate figure and former national security adviser, did the same.

The Project Democracy apparatus is attempting to sell its destruction of the Constitution to the American population on the grounds that "patriotism" is incompatible with the law. "Right-wing Social Democrats" Ben Wattenberg and Norman Podhoretz, in nationally syndicated columns, both defended the parallel government—the "patriots"—against those who dare to defend government by law. In his May 14 column, Wattenberg called the Irangate hearings a battle between the "self-identified constitutionalists," such as independent prosecutor Lawrence Walsh, who are attempting to close down the secret government, and the "self-perceived patriots"—the Richard Secords, Ollie Norths, et al., who broke the law to aid the Contras because they were "patriots."

Podhoretz expressed the same view in his May 12 column. Leaping to the defense of his son-in-law, State Department honcho Elliott Abrams, now on the chopping block for his role in the Iran-Contra scheme, Podhoretz bitterly attacked prosecutor Walsh, who "seems bent on establishing the criminality of a good many of the Americans who have

tried to help those Nicaraguans fighting and dying to reclaim a democratic revolution that has been stolen from them by the Communists." If Walsh "should go on bringing indictments for actions that were neither clearly illegal nor customarily subject to criminal penalties, there will be no escaping the conclusion that the real 'crime' for which he wants to put patriotic American citizens in jail is helping the Contras in their struggle to liberate Nicaragua from Communist domination."

A Russian 'constitution'

Elsewhere in this issue, *EIR* founder Lyndon LaRouche, notes that Moscow intends to impose a parliamentary system on the United States to ensure its status as a satrapy in Russia's new world empire. Under this arrangement, LaRouche writes, "Moscow could quickly and quietly dump any head of government who displeased the imperial overlords, without having to upset the system of self-government charitably allowed to us."

In fact, the growth of the parallel government has coincided with a significant shift by the United States in the direction of a de facto parliamentary system, especially in the last several years. The lines between the duties and obligations of the executive and legislative branches have been increasingly blurred, through such intrusions by Congress as the War Powers Act and the Boland amendment. Currently, Congress is attempting to arrogate to itself the right to make and unmake treaties, exemplified by its insistence that President Reagan adhere to SALT II and maintain the so-called "narrow" interpretation of the ABM Treaty.

The central figure involved in the invisible government's attack on the Constitution is Lloyd Cutler, a leading member of the Trilateral Commission and former counsel to Jimmy

Carter during the period in which the Carter administration brought Khomeini to power in Iran, and then struck a series of secret agreements to send arms to the Ayatollah's anti-Western regime.

Cutler first publicly staked out his opposition to the Constitution in a Fall 1980 *Foreign Affairs* article, in which he argued that the United States must adopt a parliamentary system on the grounds that the constitutional form of government, with its commitment to constituency representation, was incapable of imposing either economic austerity or selling out American strategic interests.

Cutler subsequently formed the Committee on the Constitutional System, a group of 50-plus "insiders" which is lobbying up a storm on behalf of a parliamentary government. In January, the CCS issued its formal recommendations, all of which would eliminate the separation of powers and give increasingly merged political parties dictatorial powers.

The CCS's proposals include extending the terms of House members to four years and making them co-terminous with that of the President; allowing members of Congress to serve in the cabinet; establishing public financing of congressional campaigns, with the monies to be channelled through the parties, etc.

White House Chief of Staff Howard Baker gave an interview to James Reston of the *New York Times* May 12, in which he lauded the CCS report, and said he planned to arrange a meeting between Cutler and President Reagan to discuss it. Baker told Reston, "I'd commend to you Lloyd Cutler's piece on reforming the political system." He elaborated: "A four-year term for House members, co-terminous with the President, would create an astonishing togetherness between the House and the President.

"The President has read the Cutler report," Baker added, "and I hope to have him and Cutler talk about it after the first of the year."

Cutler described himself as a "long-time friend of Baker's," and reported that, in addition to the four-year House term, Baker is also interested in CCS's proposals for amending the Constitution to provide public financing for congressional campaigns, and for tightening party control over presidential selection by giving greater weight to elected officials at nominating conventions.

Asked if Reagan is amenable to constitutional "reform," Cutler replied: "After six years of trying to deal with the problems arising from the separation of powers, in the context of a weakened party system, I would certainly expect the President to be open" to these and other recommendations. . . . We need a sober look to see if it needs to be changed for its third century."

A diatribe from McFarlane

The day after Baker's interview, former national security adviser Robert McFarlane interrupted his testimony before

the congressional Irangate committee to deliver an 11-minute lecture on what he thinks is wrong with the American government, echoing the same themes sounded by Baker and Cutler in the process.

Charging that "the relationship between this administration and the Congress has been a very stormy one" and has been "very unsuccessful" in forging cooperation on foreign policy, McFarlane then claimed, "The reasons that this has not been possible primarily lie in the Executive Branch. . . ." We must move, he said, to a situation in which the "Congress truly leads and represents power," and "the President respects his obligation to consult with that leadership and beyond." McFarlane proposed several measures to achieve this, including a four-year term for the House, and an eight-year term for the Senate, because this "would make them far more interested in the President's welfare and his policies."

He also made a bid for public financing of congressional campaigns on the grounds that this would ensure the election of people who are totally committed to their respective party's official policies. "I think that unless reform of campaign finance laws gives the leadership of the Congress some control over the purse-strings that affect people's re-election, you're going to have this disintegration of leadership on the Hill here."

To make his message absolutely clear, McFarlane referred directly to the CCS. "But it isn't for me, a person who is not a government expert, to comment on precisely what would improve matters. I refer to the commission that has been in operation for several years to study . . . how these matters might improve our ability to forge foreign policy."

The LaRouche case

It is this assault on the foundation of the American republic which lies behind the flagrantly unconstitutional attack on Lyndon LaRouche and his associates. As LaRouche explained in the last *EIR* ("The Soviet role inside Project Democracy"), he is at the center of the factional battle now being fought by patriotic elements of the American policy-making establishment against the Project Democracy gang, under the rubric of "Irangate," because he represents the one figure in the United States willing and able to identify Project Democracy as the Soviet asset that it is, and to fight it on that grounds.

For this reason, the Soviets have ordered LaRouche's elimination, and the Project Democracy apparatus has leaped to obey this order. In this context, it is instructive to note that *EIR* has just learned that the U.S.A.-Canada Institute, the Russians' premier profiler of America and a key instrument for Soviet attacks against LaRouche, has launched a project on the U.S. Constitution in the context of its bicentennial. Connected with this project are some of the same key Soviet lawyers now working with their American counterparts to declare those who support the SDI in violation of the Nuremberg statutes.