

Mark L. Melcher Publisher
melcher@thepoliticalforum.com

Stephen R. Soukup Editor
soukup@thepoliticalforum.com

THEY SAID IT

“They were careless people, Tom and Daisy — they smashed up things and creatures and then retreated back into their money or their vast carelessness, or whatever it was that kept them together, and let other people clean up the mess they had made....”

--F. Scott Fitzgerald, *The Great Gatsby*.

In this Issue

Hillary, We Hardly Know You

Hillary's Labor Pains

HILLARY, WE HARDLY KNOW YOU.

Most politicians, at some point in their careers, have to deal publicly with something in their past that has the potential to disrupt their political ambitions. This seems to have something to do with the old expression, “we’re all human.” Moral, ethical, or legal transgressions can cause serious problems for a politician. So can unconventional behavior and prior associations with unsavory groups or individuals. Sometimes, just having a close family member who is or has been involved in troublesome activity can put a politician in jeopardy.

Conventional responses to such problems vary widely, but generally include some combination of honesty, candor, contrition, silence, retaliation, anger, duplicity, obfuscation, prolixity, humor, tears, and justifications for the behavior, ranging from “I didn’t know it was wrong,” to “Everyone else does it,” to “I was drunk.”

When Grover Cleveland was running for his first term in the White House a newspaper uncovered the fact that as a young man he had fathered a child out of wedlock. When his campaign managers came to him in despair and asked what to do, his response was, “Tell the truth.”

In contrast, when rumors circulated that Bill Clinton had been involved with a young intern, he went on television, pointed his finger at the American public and lied, saying, “But I want to say one thing to the American people - I want you to listen to me. I am going to say this again. I did not have sexual relations with that woman, Ms. Lewinsky.”

One of Alabama’s most celebrated former governors, Big Jim Folsom, who once was so drunk while giving a campaign speech that he couldn’t remember the names of his children, used humor and candor to explain away his moral transgressions. In response to rumors about having been caught *flagrante delicto* with a woman who was not his wife, he answered, “Anytime you bait a trap with a good-looking blond, redhead or brunette, you’re going to catch old Jim every time.”

In his first presidential campaign President Bush applied a new twist on the old ploy of anticipating trouble and heading it off at the pass. Early on he admitted that he had been an alcoholic when he was a young man and had done things of which he was not proud. But he noted that since that time he had stopped drinking and had become a born-again Christian, which had the effect of inoculating him against many of the ramifications of transgressions that occurred during his “bad” days.

Interestingly, there is no apparent combination of responses that seems to work better than any other. Some politicians, like Bill Clinton, remain popular even when caught lying about what would seem to be several serious transgressions. Others, like former House Speaker Newt Gingrich, feel compelled to resign even after telling the truth about a much less serious personal problem.

If there is one general conclusion that can be drawn from these and the thousands of other examples that reside in the annals of American politics, it is that one of the most important factors in how well a politician survives a scandal or controversy relates to what, for lack of a better term, I will describe as likeability.

Of course, likeability alone isn't enough to save a politician from serious scandal-related problems. But it helps a great deal. And there is little question that the lack of likeability is a difficult hurdle for a politician to overcome when the fur begins to fly and voters are forced to take sides. Bill Clinton was a scoundrel, but he was a likeable one. Without his enormous charm, he very likely would have gone the way of Dick Nixon, who was never regarded warmly by the American public, but gained the presidency by working within the party and projecting a public image of competence rather than amiability.

That said, it is also important to note that the manner in which a politician deals with scandal and controversy can have a huge impact on likeability, since such a situation can provide an enormous amount of information about the individual's character and personality. After all, what could be more revealing

about someone's values, priorities, and beliefs than watching him or her during a time of stress make career-impacting choices between honesty and duplicity, anger and contrition, humor and tears, and then defend that choice before a skeptical audience?

In fact, because so much of politics today is so heavily scripted in accordance with polls, focus groups, and the requisites of fund raising, often times the only way the public ever gains a true insight into the real personality and character of a politician is when he or she is under pressure due to some difficulty that could be embarrassing or worse.

I bring this up because when thinking about the upcoming post-Bush years, it is interesting to consider that the undisputed, leading contender of the day for his job, namely Mrs. Hillary Clinton, is almost certainly going to face extremely intense public scrutiny as regards her past, which is littered with both rumors and evidence of myriad moral, ethical, and legal transgressions, unconventional behavior, prior association with unsavory groups and individuals, and at least one close family member who has been involved in considerable troublesome activity.

This is not the place to provide a catalogue of examples, but it should suffice to say that the list of charges against her, some proven some merely alleged, include accepting bribes, participating in the looting of a Savings & Loan, engineering a crooked real estate transaction, lying to a Grand Jury, marital infidelity, involvement in corrupt fund raising schemes, close associations with many extremely radical left wing organizations as well as a host of crooked labor goons, and having been intimately involved in the activities of one of the most corrupt and morally bankrupt presidents in the history of the nation.

Interestingly enough, while many of the facts surrounding these and other related issues have been widely known for years, Mrs. Clinton has never been publicly pressed hard on any of them. Of course, some questions were raised during her run for the Senate, but her response to these consisted of a combination of silence, anger, obfuscation, and

duplicity, which revealed nothing new about either the substance of the issues involved or about Mrs. Clinton herself. Anyone who had paid attention during her White House years already knew that she has little use for honesty, candor, contrition, humor, or tears.

A presidential campaign, however, is likely to be vastly different than a Senate race. Aside from the higher stakes involved, there is the rapidly growing importance and influence of the political bloggers, who will jump on a presidential candidate like a possum on a bag of garbage if they detect a concerted effort to stonewall, dissemble, or confuse what they consider to be an important issue. Then there are the new, so-called “527 organizations,” many of which are capable of spending tens of millions of dollars trashing the presidential candidate whom they oppose.

Of course, charges from these groups and organizations can be addressed by silence, anger, obfuscation, and duplicity. But as John Kerry discovered during the last campaign when he was attacked by the “Swift Boat Veterans for Truth,” if one of these well financed groups finds an issue that hits home with a substantial portion of the public, it can throw enough advertising at it to negatively impact poll numbers enough to force a candidate to respond directly to their criticisms. And again as we saw with John Kerry’s campaign, it is at this point that the public begins to gain insights into the character and personality of a candidate that were not evident when everyone was reading from a script.

In Mrs. Clinton’s case this could be an interesting experience. As her poll numbers consistently show, her “negatives” are unusually high, meaning that a relatively large number of Americans have firmly made up their minds that they do not like her and would never vote for her. This is not of crucial importance, as long as this number doesn’t exceed 50% and she can keep the rest of the public on board. As Casey Stengel once put it, “the secret of successful management is to keep the five guys who hate you away from the five guys who haven’t made up their minds.”

Her problem is that among those who haven’t made up their minds yet, her likeability factor is not high. Jacob Weisberg, editor of *Slate*, the liberal, web-based magazine, described this problem as follows:

Yet Hillary *does* face a genuine electability issue, one that has little to do with ideology, woman-hating, or her choice of life partner. Plainly put, it’s her personality. In her four years in the Senate, Hillary has proven herself to be capable, diligent, formidable, effective, and shrewd. She can make Republican colleagues sound like star-struck teenagers. But she still lacks a key quality that a politician can’t achieve through hard work: likability. As hard as she tries, Hillary has little facility for connecting with ordinary folk, for making them feel that she understands, identifies, and is at some level one of them. You may admire and respect her. But it’s hard not to find Hillary a bit inhuman. Whatever she may be like in private, her public persona is calculating, clenched, relentless—and a little robotic.

As I indicated earlier, this is a difficult hurdle for a politician to overcome since it involves factors that are largely beyond the expertise of the scriptwriters and spin doctors, and this is especially true when a politician is in the midst of a squabble over something seedy in his or her past. It is, of course, possible that Mrs. Clinton’s critics will badly overplay their hand and she will find a combination of responses that strike a sympathetic cord with the general public. That’s the beauty of politics. Anything can happen.

In the meantime, before closing I should note that when I say that the public often learns much about politicians from the way they handle nasty rows over their past, I am not referring simply to the kind of superficial, personality-related insights that are typically revealed by public figures under stress in the form of temper tantrums, self-pity, withdrawals, blame-shifting, press bashing, and rambling bouts of solipsistic babble.

I am also talking about deeper insights into a politician's character that are generally kept under wraps via the application of the techniques of theatre, which are used to create a public persona that excludes the blemishes and quirks that are known only to close friends and associates. I am talking about learning something about a person's real beliefs concerning such matters as right, wrong, truth, and honor, as well as the foundations upon which these beliefs are built.

I am talking about that seldom-seen side of a political figure, that side that is so important that even a glimpse of it can mean much. I am talking about what Carlyle described as "the things that one does practically believe . . . concerning his vital relations to this mysterious universe, and his duty and destiny there, that is in all cases the primary thing for him, and creatively determines all the rest . . . the manner it is in which he feels himself to be spiritually related to the unseen world or no world." According to Carlyle, "if you tell me what that is, you tell me to a very great extent what the man is, what the kind of things he will do is."

As I have mentioned before in these pages, a perfect case in point occurred once when Tom Brokaw was interviewing Bill Clinton at a time when Clinton was under enormous pressure concerning questions about his character. Bill's standard response had been to lie about events and question the motives of those who raised the questions. But Brokaw broke through, for one magic moment he got Bill to explain how he really felt about things, how he could live with himself given his behavior, how it all fit together.

Of course, Brokaw did not recognize it at the time, and most probably doesn't even remember it happening. Nor did anyone in the press or in the pundit community find it noteworthy. But the curtain was drawn back nevertheless, and something was revealed about Bill Clinton that future historians are likely to find remarkable.

I am talking about Bill's contention, given under stress and in response to constant browbeating, that in his opinion "character" is demonstrated "most

effectively" not by what you do in your personal life but by "what you fight for and for whom you fight." Specifically, he said he believed that the goodness of his own character should be measured by "the fact that I've stood up for the American people for things like fighting for the Family Leave Law, the Assault Weapons Ban or the Brady Bill or the v-chip for parents, or trying to keep tobacco out of the hands of kids and a lot of other issues."

This was not simply a new twist on an old debate. This was a startlingly new and portentous argument. Many politicians before Clinton had contended that character is of less importance than other attributes. And many had argued that the public is wrongly measuring their character, that allegations against them of moral or ethical laxness are lies, or exaggerated. But no American politician, to my knowledge, had ever before seriously asserted that "character" has nothing to do with personal behavior, but is a function of job performance and good intentions.

While there may be some disagreements over which specific qualities best define character, virtually all Americans would agree that the term implies some combination of Plato's classical virtues of wisdom, courage, temperance and a sense of justice; the Christian virtues of faith, hope and charity; and the Victorian virtues of work, thrift, cleanliness, self reliance, perseverance, and honesty.

When considering this situation, it is important to understand that President Clinton's assault on the traditional concept of "character" was not simply a one-time contrivance to rationalize his personal conduct. It was a break from a moral system that has been fundamental to Western society from its very beginning, that was established some three thousand four hundred years ago with the receipt of the Decalogue by Moses at Mt. Sinai. As such, it explains much about how this "caring" liberal could do what he did and feel no pangs of conscience. It is a witness to his belief that being liberal means never having to say you're sorry.

Might we get a similar insight into Mrs. Clinton's view of the importance of the moral and ethical foundations of American society? Might she, in response to the pressure of a presidential campaign shed her mask momentarily and attempt to justify in unscripted terms her past activities. Might she not, at some point, begin an answer to a probing question with the sentence, "Look, here's what I really think about that," and then provide us all with a glimpse into the belief system that governs the affairs of this woman who would be president?

Might she affirm her adherence to Bill's post-modern belief system? Or perhaps she will endorse the views of the famous Bloomsbury Group, whose members caused quite a stir in England during early years of the 20th century by rejecting what they felt were the strictures and taboos of Victorianism on religious, artistic, social and sexual matters. Their belief system, as described by its innovator, G.E. Moore, was that "Good is good," and cannot be defined in any other way; that there is no religious or ethical basis for defining "good." Thus, the conscious becomes the sole moral authority. If it seems good, it is.

Or perhaps Mrs. Clinton is a Nietzschean, and believes that traditional moral and ethical norms are simply devices used by inferior people to keep superior people like her from recognizing their full potential.

Or maybe she will say that she is profoundly sorry for some of the things she's done, apologize to the American people and to the individuals she has harmed, and announce that she has changed her ways. That would be nice.

HILLARY'S LABOR PAINS.

The past couple of weeks have brought a mixed bag of news for the Democratic Party. On the one hand, good news could be found in Senator Hillary Clinton's speech to the annual meeting of the centrist Democratic Leadership Council (DLC), the organization that was instrumental in launching her husband's presidential campaign in the late 1980s and early 90s. Most observers agree that Mrs. Clinton was the star of the gathering and made a rather compelling case for herself as a formidable future presidential candidate.

On the other hand, the bad news, which came in the form of the crack-up of the AFL-CIO, may have been demoralizing enough to overshadow even Mrs. Clinton's impressive showing. Over the past couple of decades, the labor movement – or what's left of it – has been one of the most important sources of campaign cash, volunteers, and other support for Democratic Party. And the decision by the Teamsters and the Service Employees International Union (SEIU) to leave the AFL-CIO and break with the greater movement will present a significant problem for Democrats in future campaigns, starting in the midterm election next year.

The mainstream media didn't notice it, of course, but the fact of the matter is that these two stories are related. They share significant common historical elements and together offer a glimpse of what may lie ahead if Hillary is able to turn the hype into political success and become the first woman president.

The breakup of the AFL-CIO did not happen in a political vacuum. And while it would be both inaccurate and unfair to suggest that Mrs. Clinton caused the split, it is undeniable that she and her husband played a role in Big Labor's demise. The failure of both the media and the Democratic establishment even to consider such a possibility suggests that both groups are, now five years after the end of his presidency, still so enamored with Bill and his wife that they will overlook any and all evidence that suggests that what's good for the Clintons is not always the same as what's good for the party.

For starters, the mainstream media was correct in noting that the principal disagreement that led to the split had to do with politics, union platitudes about “shifting priorities” and “movement revitalization” notwithstanding. But the conventional wisdom that suggests that the breakup has to do specifically and exclusively with AFL-CIO President John Sweeney’s decade-old strategy of throwing a great deal of money at Democratic politicians in the hopes of affecting union-friendly changes in policy misses the point entirely. Yes, the failure of the Sweeney strategy played a role in the breakup, but had that been the sole problem, the disagreement almost certainly could have been worked out on more friendly terms, allowing the AFL-CIO to be salvaged.

What the conventional wisdom misses is the fact that the two principal dissenter unions, the Teamsters and SEIU, and their leaders, James P. Hoffa and Andrew Stern respectively, had important, up-close, and personal experiences with specific members of the Democratic establishment that affected their assessment of the value of Sweeney’s plan. In short, these experiences made it clear that the Faustian bargain between Big Labor and the Democratic Party could not possibly benefit the unions as long as the only successful politicians in the party were the ones most likely to exploit the agreement to suit their own personal and political ends.

Given this, the mainstream media’s timeline of events leading to the dissolution of the labor federation is off by a couple of years. The beginning of the end for Big Labor was not, as conventional wisdom has it, the ascension of Sweeney to the presidency of the AFL-CIO in 1995, but rather the inauguration of Bill Clinton on January 20, 1993.

The day that Bill and Hillary Clinton came to town, many in the labor movement rightly understood that they now had two very powerful potential new allies. Almost immediately, Big Labor operatives went to work becoming more active in politics and in making themselves of value to the Clintons and the Democratic Party. One of the most aggressive

of these operatives was President of the Laborers International Union of North America (LIUNA) and vice president of the AFL-CIO Arthur Coia.

At the time, both Coia and his union were in serious trouble. After a three-year investigation ending in 1994, the Justice Department had filed a 212-page RICO (Racketeering and Corrupt Organizations Act) complaint against Coia and LIUNA, alleging, among other things that Coia was “tied to members of a New England Crime family and used ‘force, violence, and fear of physical injury to create a climate of intimidation and fear’ within the union.” In a consent decree filed the following year, LIUNA admitted that “many of its locals operated under the influence of organized crime.”

Nevertheless, Coia was, as the *Washington Post* noted, a “kingmaker within the AFL-CIO,” and he, LIUNA, and the AFL-CIO had exceptionally deep pockets. A January 1995 memo from the Democratic National Committee identified Coia as one of the “top ten” donors to the party and, according to the *Washington Times*, “touted [him] for access to President Clinton.”

A January, 1994 memo from Paul Coffey, then head of the Justice Department’s organized crime division, warned the Clintons to avoid “any direct contact with Coia,” but Bill and Hillary ignored that advice and instead heeded the counsel provided by the DNC. Hillary gave the keynote address to the LIUNA annual meeting in February 1995, and as Mark and I noted in an October 1999 piece, Coia proceeded to visit the “First Family at the White House 24 times in the next three-and-a-half years.”

Now, there is little question about what Bill and Hillary Clinton got out of this relationship. LIUNA gave more than \$1million to the President and his party during the 1996 election cycle. These funds comprised part of the enormous war chest that the President and his handlers used to facilitate an unorthodox campaign strategy that put Senator Bob Dole away before he’d even sown up the nomination and which, because of its success, became the new prototype strategy for incumbent presidents.

There is also little question about what Coia got out of it. Not long (a month, in fact) after the DNC's "top-ten" donor memo went out, the RICO complaint was dropped, and Coia, a man the Department of Justice called a "mob-puppet," was given the responsibility of cleaning up the union himself, a task he likely never completed, since he was forced out of the union in 2000 by prosecutors as part of a deal to avoid prosecution in a conflict of interest case

Figuring what the labor movement or even the AFL-CIO (of which Coia was a vice president, remember) got out of the Coia-Clinton relationship, however, is a little more difficult a challenge. Certainly the perpetuation of both the appearance and the actuality of corruption did little to help unions attract new members or to dispel the decades-old reputation of union bosses as crooked operators interested only in the accumulation of power.

Of course, when it comes to crooked operators interested in accumulating power, Coia and LIUNA were merely the proverbial opening act. The main event, of course, involved the Clintons, their friends at the DNC, and the Teamsters.

You may recall that in 1996 Bill Clinton was not the only "president" running for a second term. Teamsters head Ron Carey was also up for re-election. And the scam that the Democratic National Committee, the AFL-CIO, and a handful of Carey cronies at the Teamsters cooked up to ensure a Carey victory and to pad the Clinton war chest was so elaborate, so carefully planned, and so crooked that even legendary Teamsters thug Jimmy Hoffa would have been awed and amused – were his son not the target of the scam, that is. Here's how Mark and I described the Carey/DNC scam in a piece titled "It Invites Anarchy," which we wrote almost eight years ago exactly:

Following his victory [in the 1991 Teamsters Presidential election], Carey, through the good offices of Harold Ickes, a former lawyer for the New York Teamsters Local

560 and a friend of both Clintons, quickly made friends with Bill, who was on the campaign trail himself at the time. A short time later, Carey threw his union's support to the Clinton effort. This was a major coup for Bill, especially given that the Teamsters had endorsed the Republican candidate in each of the prior three presidential elections. The rest, as they say, is history.

In 1996, Carey was challenged for the union presidency by James P. Hoffa, Jimmy Hoffa's son. Carey won a very narrow victory in a race that, at the behest of the Justice Department, was monitored by the federal government at the cost of \$22 million of the taxpayer's money.

One would assume that such a "whopping sum" (in the words of the *Wall Street Journal*), would go a long way towards ensuring a fair, uncorrupted election. But one would be wrong....

In any case, the feds apparently missed a few things, as evidenced by the fact that the Carey campaign for reelection has, to date, been forced to return over \$200,000 in questionable donations, \$95,000 of which *The Washington Times* says "seems to have been embezzled from [the] union's treasury." Carey's campaign manager, Jere Nash, who recently appeared before a federal appeals court panel, invoked the Fifth Amendment when questioned about the information he gave federal investigators during last year's campaign.

Michael Ansara, the owner of a Massachusetts telemarketing company and former 60s radical, has, according to *The Wall Street Journal*, admitted to "laundering money for the Carey campaign," by serving as a funnel through which Citizen Action, "a liberal, holier-than-thou consumer

group” and recipient of \$475,000 from the Teamsters for “issue advocacy,” inappropriately (if not illegally) donated money to Carey’s re-election effort.

The most damaging and far-reaching allegations of wrongdoing against the Carey campaign, however, involve a scam allegedly masterminded by Martin Davis, Carey’s top campaign consultant and generally regarded as the man responsible for elevating Carey from a virtual unknown, to one of the most powerful union positions in America.

The scam appears to have involved the donation of union funds to Democratic candidates in a number of states in exchange for commitments from the Democratic National Committee to the Carey campaign. *The Wall Street Journal* summed it up this way:

“A 1996 memo from a former top Democratic official calls for the distribution of nearly \$1 million in Teamsters political-action-committee contributions to affiliates of the DNC nationwide. A separate note, refers to an ‘unspecified’ commitment’ by the DNC to help the Teamsters in return. The authenticity of the DNC memo has been confirmed by a former DNC official, who says the commitment was that the DNC would encourage some of its donors to contribute to the Carey campaign.”

In January 2001, nearly five years after his re-election was voided, Ron Carey was indicted by U.S. Attorney Mary Jo White for perjury and making false statements during the investigation into the 1996 race. And though he was acquitted later that year, his case had far reaching implications for his union, for the labor movement in general, and for the Democratic Party. A *Wall Street Journal* editorial dated January 30 explained why. Noting some of the more interesting information presented at the trial of Carey’s aide and Teamsters’ Political Director William Hamilton, the *Journal’s* editorial board wrote:

Trial testimony indicated that \$150,000 of the Teamster money was laundered through the AFL, and that AFL-CIO Treasurer Richard Trumka was implicated. Mr. Trumka took the Fifth Amendment when questioned about the matter by federal investigators. AFL-CIO President John Sweeney waived the union’s ban on holding office after a self-incrimination plea....

Other names arising in the testimony about donation swapping included Mr. McEntee of the Municipal Employees and **Andy Stern, chief of the Service Employees International Union**. Also, by the way, Terry McAuliffe, chairman in 1996 of the Clinton-Gore re-election effort and currently Bill Clinton’s nominee to run the Democratic National Committee. [Emphasis added]

The Journal concluded this discussion by reminding readers that “none of these men have been charged with any crime.” And none ever was. That notwithstanding, the evidence of corruption in the 1996 Teamsters presidential contest and evidence of a connection between that contest and the AFL-CIO and the Democratic National Committee are undeniable.

Again, the benefit of all of this to the Clintons is obvious. As with the LIUNA deal, they raked in the cash for the 1996 re-election effort. And the benefit to Carey is also obvious, or at it least it would be if he hadn’t been caught. But the benefit to the Teamsters is a mystery. In fact, one would be hard pressed to argue that this whole incident didn’t damage the Teamsters significantly, despite the fact that the election was overturned and the victim of the scam was eventually elected to the presidency he clearly deserved.

All of this considered, then, it’s hardly shocking that the Teamsters would feel it necessary to abandon John Sweeney and his irredeemably delusional expectation that the salvation of the labor movement

lies in its financial affiliation with the Democratic Party. As I noted above, the only surprise here is that Hoffa actually waited as long as he did before finally declaring his disillusionment with the Democrats. If anyone knows first hand the deleterious nature of the present state of relations between Big Labor and the party of Terry McAuliffe and Bill and Hillary Clinton it's Hoffa.

Now, I bring all of this up today not because I particularly enjoy slogging through the ethical cesspool that was the Clinton presidency or because I believe that all of the scandal talk will somehow make Hillary a less formidable candidate in '08. In truth, I am, as I have written several times before, actually quite impressed with the early stages of Hillary's campaign, and I believe her to be both well-positioned for a serious run at the White House and among the more politically astute and levelheaded members of her party. Though she lacks personal warmth, her manifold strengths, particularly in combination with those of her husband, will almost certainly make her a serious force in the '08 race.

All of that said, both Democrats and Republicans need to be aware that her potential rise to power will hardly be an unmitigated blessing for her party. Though most liberals are in denial about this, it is fairly obvious to any outsider that the Clinton presidency was a boon for Bill and Hillary but an absolute disaster for almost every other Democrat in the country.

The dissolution of the AFL-CIO should serve a reminder of the lasting and negative impact that the Clintons often have on the people and things with whom they have extensive dealings. The Clintons benefited nicely from Big Labor's largesse in the '90s yet gave next to nothing in return. Now, in the '00s, it appears that Big Labor itself and, by extension, the Democratic Party are going to pay the price for that unrequited munificence.

It is frankly amazing to me that despite the fact that Hillary's closest personal advisor and most trusted aide continues to be Harold Ickes, the man who introduced the Clintons to both Arthur Coia and Ron Carey, no Democrat would even consider the possibility that the current problems within the labor movement are related to the Clintons and the way they and their intimates (namely Terry McAuliffe) used the movement during Bill's presidency.

The fact that most Democrats and most labor leaders recall Bill's presidency fondly makes little sense to me since the ranks of elected Democrats and union workers (as a percentage of the workforce) both declined dramatically during those eight years. Of course, it makes even less sense that all of these same people would be as excited as they appear to be at the prospect of reliving that nightmare, no matter how competent a politician Hillary appears to be or how desperate they are to win an election.

Copyright 2005. The Political Forum. 8563 Senedo Road, Mt. Jackson, Virginia 22842, tel. 540-477-9762, fax 540-477-3359. All rights reserved.

Information contained herein is based on data obtained from recognized services, issuer reports or communications, or other sources believed to be reliable. However, such information has not been verified by us, and we do not make any representations as to its accuracy or completeness, and we are not responsible for typographical errors. Any statements nonfactual in nature constitute only current opinions which are subject to change without notice.