

...tive elements of the KGB... military to assert his control over the crumbling union of Soviet republics.

Recently, Gorbachev declared his willingness to impose emergency rule as the only means to restore order. Such a step would enable the Kremlin leader to control all levels of government by presidential decree — a move that critics charge would exceed the dictatorial powers of Joseph Stalin.

Earlier, Gorbachev replaced his moderate-minded Interior minister with a KGB hard-liner and encouraged the state security apparatus to be more vigorous in curbing dissent. Against this backdrop, an influential group of mili-

...Moscow's old guard, a factor that contributed to his resignation, as his resignation speech demonstrated.

Secretary of State James Baker appropriately warned the Soviet leadership that good relations with Washington would be jeopardized by a reversion to rule by force. Yet the reality is that the United States can exert very little influence over the course of events now unfolding in Moscow.

This nation should remain committed to democratic reform and not tie its policies to any individual. As Shevardnadze's unexpected departure shows, the fate of the current Soviet leadership is highly uncertain.



Apparently Cold War isn't quite over

Contemporary critics of the concept of a "New World Order" have a noble antecedent in James Madison. Almost exactly 200 years ago, Madison used a column in the National Gazette to dissect a scheme for a new world order proposed by Jean-Jaques Rousseau.

In 1761, Rousseau — the fountainhead of modern radicalism — presented a plan for "perpetual peace." Rousseau recommended "A confederation of sovereigns, under a council of deputies, for the double purpose of arbitrating external controversies among nations, and of guarantying their respective governments against internal revolutions." It is ironic, but hardly inexplicable, that Rousseau was both the apostle of revolution and the architect of a structure of reactionary absolutism.

Madison noted that Rousseau's plan took into consideration neither the distinct interests of individual nations nor "The tendency of his plan to perpetuate arbitrary power wherever it existed." If Rousseau's plan didn't perish as a result of the collision of contending national interests, Madison warned it would erect a structure of supranational sovereignty, thereby "extinguishing the hope of one day seeing an end of oppression" — it would produce the triumph of absolutism.

Madison's prescription for peace involved the subordination of the war-making power to the "will of the community" (as interpreted by the representatives of the community), and compelling "Each generation (to) bear its own burdens" regarding the financial costs of war. Madison's riposte to Rousseau was an unapologetic assertion of American constitutionalism.



Will Grigg

ABROAD

Bearing in mind the contrast between Rousseau's foggy universalism and Madison's constitutional nationalism, it is instructive to examine the actions of the Bush administration in its crusade against Hussein.

President Bush has conspicuously cultivated the approval of the U.N. — Rousseau's "Confederation of Sovereigns." Former U.N. Ambassador Kirkpatrick has observed that Bush is "Explicitly engaged in an effort to strengthen the United Nations as part of his vision of a New World Order."

The pursuit of the U.N.'s imprimatur has been conducted at the expense of consultation with Congress. Several spokesmen for the administration — most notably Secretary of State James Baker — have explicitly stated that the administration considers the approval of the U.N. to be more significant than that of Congress.

Madison taught that peace could be secure — and just wars effectively prosecuted — if the Congress is invested with the war-making power and compelled to act responsibly in its management of public funds. This is necessary in order to guarantee that war would serve plausibly

defined national interests and not the caprice of a governing class.

Bush — a creature of the governing class — has yet to submit to Congress a binding bill of particulars against Iraq (a Newsweek article does not qualify); by dispatching Baker on global fund-raising tours Bush has found a way to circumvent the financial authority of Congress.

There may be compelling reasons for an invasion of Kuwait and an attack upon Iraq; I remain unconvinced. Like some congressional skeptics, I await the articulation of a tangible national interest that would be served by war in the gulf; I have yet to find such an interest listed among the scatter-shot rationales for war emitted by the administration.

American blood and treasure should not be expanded in enterprises that diminish American sovereignty. As matters stand now, the excursion to the Gulf threatens to attenuate the sovereignty of America's war-making prerogative. If a case against Hussein can be framed in terms of strictly construed American interests, a declaration of war should be obtained, money should be allotted for the war's prosecution, and America should resolve to avail itself of every means at its disposal to obtain victory. Absent such a defining declaration, there is no reason to send troops into offensive combat.

The Cold War has been a clash between the ideas of James Madison and those of Rousseau (of whom Marx was an intellectual descendant.) The "first post-Cold War crisis" is revealing America's president to be a "Rosseauist" rather than a Madisonian; in this sense the Cold War is far from over.

Letters

Self-perpetuating?

Editor: Having just watched C-Span unveil the National Mayor's conference, and hearing Boston's mayor Flynn lament the terrible condition of the severely ill mental patients (major mental illnesses), now called "street people," I am going to reiterate an earlier letter. In 1964, President Kennedy was persuaded that state hospitals were "warehouses" for the mentally ill and should be dismantled in favor of the community mental health centers we now have. It was stipulated, however, that 70 percent of the center's budget would be used for the major illnesses. That requirement still exists but will continue to be ignored until our state executive lowers the boom.

It appears to this writer that excessive administrative staffing and abundant clerical personnel are prospering at the expense of patient care, and the center's themselves seem to be a self-perpetuating bureaucracy. (another one).

Eugene J. Faux, M.D.
Provo

Reconsider suit

Editor: Along with thousands or perhaps millions of others, my heart went out to the Utah family that recently lost a son in a tragic subway killing in New York City. No one with children could fail to be touched by the loss of a loved child, and that loss was compounded manifold by the manner of the loss. Along with extending my sympathy, as father and an attorney, I have had to ask myself what I would do in that situation. I think I would reconsider a suit against the city of New York for \$100 million. I can't afford it.

Having been recently associated with Daies County government, I know what a concern potential government liability is. For long ago, the company providing catastrophic coverage for the county went out of business. I believe that the county lost some of its premiums and is unable to recover them. Fortunately it did not lose any claims coverage. Were the county to be hit with a \$100 million suit, it could look to an insurer for the first million and would then have to pay to the citizens through tax increases for the balance. I am sure that New York has larger

tion. There will always be "negligence" in someone's eyes.

For the world that all of our children will inherit, I hope all of us will mentally reconsider the current law suit.

Robert D. Rose
Bountiful

Chance to live

Editor: With more than a bit of concern, I read the letter by Kristy Morris in the Dec. 17 Herald. I was surprised to read that such an obviously literate person could be so shallow, narrow-minded and just plain illogical.

Ms. Morris' attempts to justify her pro-choice views were pathetic at best, and did nothing more than to let the thinking community know that there is at least one more individual in the crusade to establish right and wrong who has founded her opinion on nothing more than general assumptions and logical loopholes.

I fail to see how Ms. Morris can argue a case for abortion by mentioning the fact that over 50,000 women died as a result of undergoing abortive procedures during the Vietnam era. This seems to me to be an argument against abortion, rather than a premise for legalizing the activity. I know if someone offered to let me do something that had killed over 50,000 people, I probably wouldn't do it.

Ms. Morris' naivete is evident in her argument that, because they often have low self-esteem, unwanted children should be aborted before they have the chance to become a dysfunctional member of society. It seems she is trying to offer a cop-out rather than a solution to a problem that affects not only those children who were conceived unintentionally, but those of us who, being human, are subject to human foibles. Ms. Morris implies that the jails are full of people who should have been aborted rather than suffer the harsh realities of being alive today.

I think that most of the people in these jails will tell you that, given the choice of life or death, they will invariably choose life.

She asserts that she is pro-child. This is like saying Hitler was pro-Jew. I understand that the abortion issue is one of enormous proportions, and I understand that mothers are heir to some very sacred rights. However, these rights do not extend so far as to determine whether a child has at least a

Orphan Drug bill gets firms busy lobbying

WASHINGTON — Cut-throat lobbying on Capitol Hill by a few biotech companies has backfired in their faces and in the process angered more than a few members of Congress. Now the companies that shelled out thousands of dollars for lobbyists this year will have to do the same again next year.

The fireworks began when a few well-intentioned members of Congress decided it was time to rewrite the Orphan Drug Act of 1983. Under that law, companies that develop drugs for treating rare diseases get a seven-year monopoly on marketing rights for those drugs with no price controls. The idea was to give companies an incentive to produce drugs that other-



Jack Anderson & Dale Van Atta

UNITED FEATURE SYNDICATE

Biotech companies with profits on the line fought back with a vengeance. One company, Genentech Inc., which makes a human growth hormone that is protected as an orphan drug, hired lobbyists to

continue charging whatever they want for their drugs."

EXPOSED ARTERIES — The Pentagon battle plans for a war with Iraq are taking into account Iraq's limited infrastructure. One school of thought in the Pentagon is that Saddam Hussein could be crippled economically for years if the right facilities were destroyed. Iraq has four primary roads connecting Baghdad to Turkey, Iran, Jordan and Kuwait. By knocking them out, the United States could cut off supplies to the Iraqi army. And by taking out major factories and oil refineries, Saddam would be hard pressed to rattle his sabre for a few years, even if he were left in power.

This... evolving... and... dish... In... Norwi... Poelis... May... fits tog... but on... is corr... layers... only if... Bewa... out... "Doubt... insid... more a... Appa... want... they're... frissons... zles ra... "petite... like you... foundin...

