

gram, based primarily on some meager investment in the transportation grid, combined with building up U.S. environmental and communications technology—hardly a program for what the United States desperately needs, an industrial renaissance.

The Clinton-Democrat proposals borrow heavily from Felix Rohatyn's "Rebuild America" plan. Like Rohatyn's, financing would come through a combination of hiking taxes and looting pension plans. Although Clinton claims he will raise taxes only on those earning over \$200,000 a year, he has made it plain that his version of the Rohatyn plan also depends for the bulk of its financing on public and private pension funds. However, as LaRouche has recently pointed out, most U.S. pension funds exist only on paper; they were bled dry in the 1980s by investing in junk bonds, leveraged buyouts, etc. Thus, even Clinton's pallid infrastructure development plan is a non-starter.

- A foreign policy which contains no truly substantive differences from the Bush administration's, except, perhaps, its overt pandering to the Israeli lobby, expressed in the platform's recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel.

Regarding U.S. military policy, the platform reads like a script for Bush's "Pox Americana." It says the United States should beef up its "rapid deployment capabilities to deal with new threats to our security posed by renegade dictators, terrorists, international drug traffickers, and the local armed conflicts that can threaten the peace of entire regions." It further states that the U.S. "must lead a renewed international effort to get tough with companies that peddle nuclear and chemical warfare technologies, strengthen the International Atomic Energy Agency, and enforce strong sanctions against governments that violate international restraints."

- Embrace of the radical environmentalist agenda. As the Democratic platform puts it, the United States must "become a leader . . . in the fight against global warming" and agree to "limit carbon dioxide emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2000." The U.S. must also engage in an aggressive campaign to bring the "explosive population growth" under control.

- A "newspeak" version of "family values": The Democrats, having become notorious (and to some extent unelectable) during the past 20 years by embracing every perversion under the sun, decided to recast themselves this year as the party of "family values." Even Hillary Clinton has got into the act, distributing chocolate chip cookies to reporters.

Family values? From Clinton, who spent much of the primary season courting the "gay" lobby, garnering the enthusiastic backing of the leading homosexual political organization? And from Gore, who—despite his wife Tipper's highly publicized crusade against pornographic rock lyrics—is a devotee of the pagan goddess Gaia?

What the Democrats mean by "family values" was summed up by Clinton's discussion of abortion in his speech to the convention. I'm not pro-abortion, Clinton told the delegates; I'm merely "pro-choice."

The DLC and the new feudalism

by Kathleen Klenetsky

When Bill Clinton extolled the virtues of his fascist "new covenant" in his acceptance speech to the Democratic Party, he was sounding a theme closely identified with the Democratic Leadership Council. Founded in early 1985 after Walter Mondale's trouncing by Ronald Reagan in the 1984 presidential elections, the DLC was the brainchild of a group of Southern Democrats, who claimed to want to steer the party into a more "mainstream" direction.

The initiators of the DLC included Sens. Sam Nunn (D-Ga.) and Chuck Robb (D-Va.), and Reps. Richard Gephardt (D-Mo.) and John Breaux (D-La.). Both Clinton and Gore joined the group; Clinton eventually became the DLC's chairman, and only resigned last year, when he formally declared for the presidency.

It hasn't taken long for what the DLCers meant by "mainstream" to become apparent—and it certainly isn't a return to the pre-McGovern reform period in which the party tended, more or less, to represent legitimate constituency groups, such as labor, urban ethnic machines, farmers, and civil rights layers, and fought to some extent, as John F. Kennedy did, for economic development and scientific progress.

Instead, the DLC, along with its think tank, the Progressive Policy Institute, has established itself as the leading exponent of the view that the Democratic Party can only succeed politically if it abandons these constituencies, and reorients toward the yuppie suburban vote, the lawyers, accountants, stockbrokers, and other parasites who have proliferated as the productive base of the U.S. economy has collapsed.

The Democratic Party's just-completed convention in New York bears witness to the DLC's success. Not only did the party nominate two of the DLC's leading members, but the platform it adopted, with its talk of "rights and responsibilities" and a new social contract, was lifted straight from the DLC's policy pronouncements.

Indeed, the transformation of the Democratic Party into the party of yuppie post-industrialism, can be credited in large measure to the efforts of the DLC.

Writing in the July 1992 issue of the group's magazine *New Democrat*, DLC president Al From calls on the Democratic Party to recognize that "America is going through a political transformation as power shifts from the central cities to the suburbs." "If the Democrats cast their lot with the cities," From warns, "they sharply diminish their chance of winning."

The July issue's theme, proclaimed on the cover, is

“Forging a New Social Contract,” while articles deal with various aspects of Clinton’s “new covenant.” In “The Politics of Reciprocity,” PPI President Will Marshall writes that “America’s now predominantly suburban electorate . . . does not pine for massive public works spending or urban bailouts”; thus, pragmatic Democrats should tailor their policies to appeal to suburban biases, such as antipathy to “welfare cheats.”

One of the most succinct summaries of the DLC’s outlook is a recent comment made by Richard Lamm, the former governor of Colorado, who created a furor in 1984 when he called on the elderly to “die and get out of the way.” In his *New Democrat* piece, Marshall approvingly quotes Lamm’s remark: “The essence of this new world is that the economy of the 1990s cannot support the dreams of the 1960s. The public policy of the world’s largest debtor nation, which has among the lowest rate of productivity growth in the industrialized world, must be dramatically different than when it was the world’s largest creditor nation with the highest rate of productivity growth.”

The new feudal paradigm

The DLC has been derided by some Democrats for attempting to “Republicanize” the party. But in fact the DLC has teamed up with the “new paradigm” Republicans (Jack Kemp, Newt Gingrich, et al.) and the “new right” Heritage Foundation to forge a “new covenant” that represents a return to Confederate-style feudalism.

For two years now, DLC leaders have been meeting privately with key members of the Heritage network. Earlier this year, the PPI joined with Heritage to sponsor a conference on “beyond left and right,” where discussion centered on how to reduce government services of all kinds, while convincing the population that being freed of such nasty government interventionism as municipally run garbage service will bring them “empowerment.”

The point of these meetings, Marshall explains, was to arrive at a “third way, a new choice that combines the valid insights of the left and the right in a progressive governing philosophy for the 1990s,” one which “rejects the old choice between conservative neglect and liberal entitlements in favor of a new politics of reciprocity.”

“The outlines of this new policy of reciprocity,” Marshall says, “can be seen in the ‘New Covenant’ reforms of Gov. Bill Clinton,” in the “revival of communitarian thinking,” as reflected in sociologist Amitai Etzioni’s “new communitarian” movement, “and even in the conservative empowerment movement led by Jack Kemp and the Heritage Foundation’s Stuart Butler.”

It should be noted that Kemp proposes to “empower” people by selling the country’s rotting public housing stock to tenants, while Butler, a member of the British Fabian Society, wants to “empower” inner-city residents by building “enterprise zones,” in which regulations on working condi-

tions, benefits, and wages would be suspended.

Ironically, the DLC-Heritage combine has converged on the community control approach favored by the 1960s New Left—which, in turn, was engineered by the Ford Foundation, the late Robert Hutchins’s Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, and other establishment entities, for the explicit purpose of softening up the U.S. population to a form of fascist economics based on “communitarianism” or “fascism with a democratic face.”

Since the DLC has jettisoned the idea of economic progress, it is hardly surprising that its policy prescriptions call for austerity in various guises. For example, the PPI’s first policy statement, issued in 1989, opposed an increase in the minimum wage. Author Robert Shapiro, the institute’s vice president for economic studies, currently advises the Clinton campaign.

Welfare has become a DLC-PPI *bête noire*, reflected in Clinton’s vow to “end welfare as we know it,” and the DLC and PPI have lobbied for various “workfare” programs. Other pet DLC-PPI projects include national service—under which a college student could not qualify for a government loan, unless he agreed to either serving in the armed forces or work for the government in a community service job, at below the prevailing wage; and community policing.

The DLC and PPI call their policies “entrepreneurial government.” According to the best-known exponent of this concept, David Osborne, a DLC fellow and Clinton adviser, entrepreneurial government means putting government on a business footing, by contracting out government services to private companies, instituting a system of school vouchers, streamlining bureaucracies, tenant management of public housing, etc.

Although Osborne, in his latest book, *Reinventing Government*, protests that entrepreneurial government is not specifically aimed at facilitating austerity, that is clearly the object. As he and other DLCers admit, government costs can only be reduced if wages and benefits are cut and entitlements slashed—in other words, if the standard of living is driven down.

The power of the DLC should not be underestimated. The group claims hundreds of members, many of them government officials, all over the country. The organization maintains chapters in nearly 30 states, has an annual budget of \$2.5 million, and retains 19 full-time staff members.

President Al From formerly worked for Democrats for the Eighties, the influential political action committee founded by Pamela Churchill Harriman, widow of the late Democratic Party *éminence grise*, Averell Harriman. Its trustees includes representatives of some of the leading Wall Street and related firms which played instrumental roles in the post-industrial destruction of the U.S. economy, such as Barrie Wigmore, a limited partner at Goldman Sachs; Michael Steinhardt of Steinhardt Partners; and Linda Peek, a vice president with RJR Nabisco.