

Mark L. Melcher Publisher
melcher@thepoliticalforum.com

Stephen R. Soukup Editor
soukup@thepoliticalforum.com

In this Issue

The Long March to Ned Lamont.

Lieberman, Lanny, and the
Democratic Party.

THEY SAID IT

The political odyssey of Norman Podhoretz began in the mid-1950s, when he made his mark as a literary critic and heir apparent of the leftward “New York intellectuals”; veered sharply toward radicalism in the early ‘60s; and ultimately rejected the ascendant hard left for what we now recognize as neoconservatism. “The issue was America,” he says. “I was repelled, almost nauseated, by the rise of anti-Americanism on the left. The hatred of this country seemed to me not only wrong, it was disgusting....Everything the left was saying about America was wrong – everything – and wrong by 180 degrees.” He likens it to “staging a black mass, with the cross inverted and Christ hanging by his feet.”

Joseph Rago, “Unrepentant Neocon,” *The Wall Street Journal*, August 12, 2006.

THE LONG MARCH TO NED LAMONT.

We began to directly address the subject of the rapidly changing nature of liberalism and conservatism about 10 years ago, starting with an article entitled “The New Political Paradigm” in 1997, moving on to one called “Liberalism RIP” in 1998, and to a three part series entitled “The Dawn of a New Political Era” in 1999. The underlying message in all of these pieces was that the traditional fault lines between the two political movements were in the process of being replaced by new, more “modern” ones.

We noted that the old political flash points, dating to the Roosevelt era and earlier, involved such issues as labor vs. capital, big government vs. small government, and the extent to which the federal government should be involved in racial integration efforts and wealth redistribution programs. The newly emerging paradigm, we said, was more closely tied to social and cultural issues, things such as abortion policy, gay rights, women’s rights, the role of religion in the public square, and a host of related matters that fell under the rubric of “family values.”

In the years since, we have discussed many reasons for the waning importance of the issues that stoked the political fires of old. These include the fact that widespread prosperity lessened the tension between American labor and American capital; reduced the existence of the kind of poverty that can be alleviated by government wealth redistribution plans; and helped the African-American community achieve a much higher level of equality, which took much of the steam out of the partisanship that had marked the great civil rights movement of earlier years. Finally, the federal government became so large and overwhelmingly influential that the Republicans basically gave up trying to limit its growth and joined with the Democrats in the task of feeding the behemoth.

History attests to the fact that the old issues served the Democrats well. Their stance on these matters appealed to the natural generosity and can-do optimism of Americans and allowed the Democratic Party to make a strong claim on the moral high ground. With no equivocation, Democrats openly maintained that they were doing God's work. They continually asserted that moral considerations were paramount to their "deep concern" for the "little guy," the "working stiff," the "oppressed," the "victim." They also claimed to have a moral obligation to harness the great power of the federal government for the purpose of "doing good," while the Republicans spent their energies doing well.

The new cultural issues turned out to be more politically troublesome for them. Over time, their struggles to define their position on these matters fostered a deep antagonism toward America's traditional moral and ethical norms, and this naturally developed into clearly evident antipathy toward the concept of American exceptionalism. They marketed their positions on these issues under the banner of high-minded efforts to free people from the "oppressive yoke" of outdated traditions based on religious bigotry. But their efforts quickly took on a strong odor of moral decadence and anti-Americanism. We described the process this way in the above-mentioned piece entitled "Liberalism RIP."

Old time liberals, like Franklin Roosevelt, Lyndon Johnson, and Hubert Humphrey maintained that liberalism was not just compatible with traditional Judeo-Christian beliefs, but was actually a logical extension of such values. They had no qualms about claiming that God was on their side.

Modern day liberals occasionally try to make this connection also. But their heart isn't in it. Since the 1960s, liberalism has become aggressively secular. Conventional moral and ethical values are viewed as "intolerant," "judgmental."

An alternative value system needed to be developed. And it was. The heart of this system is a variety of "ists" and "phobes."

Character, under this system, isn't measured by a person's actions, but by how he or she feels about things.

The centerpiece of this system is a series of epitaphs such as "racist," "sexist," "chauvinist," and "homophobe."

Traditional "no nos," such as perjury, adultery, dishonesty, theft, and even boorish behavior toward a member of the opposite sex are not *ipso facto* wrong. Under this system, it depends on the politics of who is doing it.

This system is enforced by something I once described as "one of the most powerful political weapons ever devised by man, namely the terrible swift sword of political correctness." This enormously powerful tool is modeled on Marxist propaganda dogma. So far as I know, it was first described by Orwell in his great novel *1984*. He called it "Newspeak," and described it as means by which the state progressively narrowed the range of ideas and independent thought.

While extremely popular in liberal circles, the Democratic Party's increasingly apparent antipathy toward traditional moral and ethical norms, as well as toward the U.S. military, began to eat away at the Party's support among centrist voters. This process began to accelerate early on in the Clinton presidency when it became obvious to anyone paying attention that this president's family was openly disdainful of members of the U.S. military and that the president himself subscribed to a very different set of values from those embodied in the traditional Judeo-Christian-based system of morals and ethics.

The problem was not just that Bill was dishonest and debauched. The White House had been home to innumerable immoral crooks over the years, so another one was no big deal. Indeed, most Americans recognized that such men are a normal part of the Judeo-Christian moral system, or as Eberhard Schlegel, the dark theologian in Mann's *Doctor Faustus* argued, good and evil are interdependent, one needing the other to be relevant.

The problem with Bill was different. It wasn't that he violated traditional moral and ethical rules. It was that he didn't subscribe to them in the first place. His belief system was homespun nihilism. It did not encompass the concept of individual sin and redemption. It reflected the belief that one's personal behavior was not the proper measure of one's moral fitness. This view was once described by the somewhat nutty, but well-known, post-modern philosopher Richard Rorty, a frequent guest at the Clinton White House in the early years, who argued that the mere "expression of liberal opinions guarantees personal innocence in a cruel world." Bill himself once explained this distinction to Tom Brokaw, when he asserted that for liberals like himself "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" on the battlefield of politics.

The resultant impeachment process presented Democrats with a terrible dilemma. It brought them to that point once described by Robert Penn Warren "where the formula fails in the test tube, where chaos and old night hold sway and we hear the laughter in the ether dream." They had to make a very difficult choice. They could no longer pretend that Bill was an innocent victim of a "vast right wing conspiracy." They had to come to grips with the fact that he was not just a liar, but also a perjurer. He had called upon God to witness the truth in what he had so say and had then lied.

Democrats knew that this had once been considered a highly serious crime because it tore at the very fabric of government. In his farewell message to Congress, President Washington had directly addressed the importance of telling the truth under oath when he asked "Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice?"

So Democrats had to choose whether to honor the old traditions, customs, laws, and the wisdom of George Washington or embrace a new way of securing the property, reputation, and lives of American citizens

in which the sense of religious obligation is no longer an important element of the oaths that are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice. They had to choose. And choose they did.

Of course, the Democrats didn't arrive at this verge in their ideological history by accident. The radical left wing of the Party had grown increasingly strong throughout the last half of the 20th century as the baby boom generation came of age and began to openly challenge the relevancy of the Judeo-Christian moral and ethical traditions of their parents. The movement's ultimate victory was the presidential election of Bill Clinton, an amoral, lying, corrupt, coat-and-tie radical from the glory days of the 1960s, "hot as a leak and amorous as a goat," to borrow a phrase once used to describe the liberal, British Prime Minister David Lloyd George.

Ironically, but not surprisingly, Bill's election triumph was the beginning of the party's winter of discontent. As he put it on his way out the door, he had had a wonderful time as President. But on his watch the Democratic Party lost control of both Houses of Congress, as well as countless governorships and seats in state legislatures. Indeed, during his presidency the Democratic Party became the nation's minority party after holding the title as the majority party for at least a half a century.

Slowly, in the wake of this disaster the Democratic Party leaders grudgingly began to recognize that a large segment of the American population was still intensely patriotic, proud of the U.S. military, firmly attached to the old American values, and deeply concerned that the licentiousness and anti-Americanism, which had become so much a part of the Democratic Party's persona, was hurting their children and their families as well as the nation's overall social health. To put this another way, the Democratic Party's leaders began to realize that while the keg fest at the swamp had been fun for the party goers, it had been hell on the frogs.

So they nominated Joe Lieberman to run with Bill's ethically tarnished Vice President, Al Gore, hoping against hope that this proudly patriotic Democrat,

who was not ashamed to publicly state his devotion to his Jewish faith, would convince centrist voters that the Democratic Party had not completely abandoned respect for the underlying beliefs of a majority of Americans.

But it didn't work. Lieberman made the party's left wing base desperately uncomfortable. In fact, the Anti-Defamation League became so distressed by his open assertions of his faith that they warned him publicly of their belief that "there is a point at which an emphasis on religion in a political campaign becomes inappropriate and even unsettling in a religiously diverse society such as ours."

In one particularly revealing instance, the Hollywood smut peddlers threatened to turn off the money spigot to the Democratic Party in light of Lieberman's attempts to pass legislation that would penalize them for marketing sex and violence to the nation's children. Needless to say, Joe relented, eventually promising the pornographers a \$4.2 million Hollywood fundraiser, "We will never, never put the government in the position of telling you by law, through law, what to make. We will noodge you, but never become censors."

In any case, the Democrats lost the election. And they did not markedly improve their standing with the American public in time for the next one, when they again lost the White House and offered up additional seats to the Republicans in the House and the Senate.

After that election, the polls indicated specifically that "moral values" had played a significant part in the public's decision to stay with the GOP. Many Democratic Party leaders acknowledged this and pledged that in the future the Party would demonstrate its strong commitment to faith and "moral values." Nancy Pelosi, for example, told CNN's Wolf Blitzer that because "faith is such an important part of the lives of most people in our country" Democrats have to convince voters that "many of the people who are in politics on the Democratic side do so according to the -- the gospel of Matthew and indeed the Bible." She admitted that "we don't demonstrate it clear [sic]

enough" but argued that "Democrats are faith-filled" and vowed to get this fact across better in the future.

In truth, however, it is likely that the 2004 election will go down in history as the last one fought by the Democrats on Republican turf. With the recent defenestration of Joe Lieberman from the Party, the ascendance of Howard Dean to the Party's chairmanship, the growing influence of the left wing blogger community within the Party, and the importance to the Party of campaign contributions from the radical, new-media based organizations such as moveon.org and Americans Coming Together, Democrats will henceforth fight exclusively on their own turf, eschewing any claim to being paladins of Judeo-Christian dogma and America's traditional customs and mores.

Americans will see no more Joe Liebermans, offered up as evidence that Democrats are "moral", as defined by Republicans; no more John Kerrys, offered up as evidence that Democrats are "strong on defense," as defined by Republicans; and no Hillary Clintons, offered up as a evidence that the Democrats are willing to change their spots at will if that's what it takes to convince voters that they are no different from Republicans. If Hillary wants to win the nomination of today's Democratic Party, our guess is that she'll have to put on the old radical spots from her Wellesley-days and wear them proudly.

In short, the Democrat Party is close to being what it has been in the process of becoming since the 1960s. This new party will be field tested this November, modified and re-engineered during the next two years, and the final product will be unveiled in the fall of 2008 at the Democratic Convention. Our guess is that it will be a smash hit with the Ned Lamont voters in the Blue States, where the Democratic Party already has a lock on the electoral votes, and that it will make the ordinary people in the Red States wonder what ever happened to the Democratic Party of FDR, the party that paid homage to the God of Abraham, courted American patriots, and smote America's enemies.

LIEBERMAN, LANNY, AND THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

It goes without saying that events in the Middle East, in Great Britain, and here at home over the past several weeks have been rather unsettling. The ever-present Islamic terrorist threat and the increasingly contentious domestic political debate over that threat of late have hit many American quite hard. But they have hit American Jews harder than most. Not only have they seen their co-religionists in Israel attacked by two distinct Islamist enemies and then vilified by the “global community” for daring to defend themselves, but they have also seen the most prominent American Jewish politician, a man only six years removed from his party’s vice presidential nomination, purged from that party, ostensibly for the crime of being too supportive of this nation’s security interests.

The crisis of confidence that these events set off within the Jewish community was, fortunately, captured for posterity by the editorial page of *The Wall Street Journal*, which on successive days last week ran contributions from two prominent Jewish liberals, whose erstwhile unshakable political and moral beliefs appear to have been shaken gravely by the course of these events. Taken together, the two pieces provide a veritable treasure trove of insight into modern American politics.

For starters, the articles provide a foundation on which to base forecasts about the behavior of Jewish voters in the post 9/11, post-Lieberman, post-Lebanon world. But they do more than this. Together, the pieces constitute the perfect distillation of the political attitudes and beliefs that have caused the shift in political fortunes between the two major parties over the last four decades and which, given the drift of current events, promise to maintain that shift on some limited scale, at least until the threat posed by radical Islam has been unquestionably defeated.

The first of these two important columns appeared on Tuesday, the day that Connecticut Democrats rejected their three-term incumbent, Joe Lieberman, in favor of the consummate trust-fund liberal, Ned Lamont, who distinguished himself from Lieberman principally by being opposed to the war in Iraq and by not being Jewish.

The piece was penned by long-time liberal insider Lanny Davis, who, among other things, served as Special Counsel to President Bill Clinton, and who nonetheless emerged from his White House service with his faith in the infallibility of liberal dogma intact.

Ironically, though, it seems that those Democrats who attacked Lieberman so harshly and maliciously have finally convinced Davis that liberals too can be less than perfect, something that not even Bill, Hillary, and their multiple independent counsels could manage to do. Davis described his awakening thusly:

The far right does not have a monopoly on bigotry and hatred and sanctimony. Here are just a few examples (there are many, many more anyone with a search engine can find) of the type of thing the liberal blog sites have been posting about Joe Lieberman:

■ “Ned Lamont and his supporters need to [g]et real busy. Ned needs to beat Lieberman to a pulp in the debate and define what it means to be an American who is NOT beholden to the Israeli Lobby” (by “rim,” posted on Huffington Post, July 6, 2006).

■ “Joe’s on the Senate floor now and he’s growing a beard. He has about a weeks growth on his face . . . I hope he dyes his beard Blood red. It would be so appropriate” (by “ctkeith,” posted on Daily Kos, July 11 and 12, 2005).

■ On “Lieberman vs. Murtha”: “as everybody knows, jews ONLY care about the welfare of other jews; thanks ever so much for reminding everyone of this most salient fact, so that we might better ignore all that jewish propaganda [by Lieberman] about participating in the civil rights movement of the 60s and so on” (by “tomjones,” posted on Daily Kos, Dec. 7, 2005).

■ “Good men, Daniel Webster and Faust would attest, sell their souls to the Devil. Is selling your soul to a god any worse?”

Leiberman cannot escape the religious bond he represents. Hell, his wife's name is Haggadah or Muffeletta or Diaspora or something you eat at Passover" (by "gerrylong," posted on the Huffington Post, July 8, 2006).

■ "Joe Lieberman is a racist and a religious bigot" (by "greenskeeper," posted on Daily Kos, Dec. 7, 2005).

And these are some of the nicer examples.

One Sunday morning on C-Span I debated *Nation* editor Katrina Vanden Heuvel on the Lieberman versus Lamont race. Afterwards I received a series of emails--many of them in ALL CAPS (which often suggests the hyper-frenetic state of these extremist haters)--that were of the same stripe as the blog posts, and filled with the same level of personal hate.

But the issue is not just emotional outbursts by these usually anonymous bloggers. A friend of mine just returned from Connecticut, where he had spoken on several occasions on behalf of Joe Lieberman. He happens to be a liberal antiwar Democrat, just as I am. He is also a lawyer. He told me that within a day of a Lamont event--where he asked the candidate some critical questions--some of his clients were blitzed with emails attacking him and threatening boycotts of their products if they did not drop him as their attorney. He has actually decided not to return to Connecticut for the primary today; he is fearful for his physical safety.

Now, anyone who has been paying even the remotest attention could have warned Davis of this. In the five years since September 11, the heretofore generally latent anti-Semitism of the modern left has grown progressively less and less latent. There is little question that the overwhelming majority of anti-Semitic political sentiment can be found today on the

political left, both in the United States and in Europe. Unbeknownst to Davis apparently, the American right has largely exorcised its anti-Semitic demons, while the left has embraced them, if not wholeheartedly, then certainly with ghastly enthusiasm.

And it's not merely Jews whom the left hates. Davis may have convinced himself that American "liberals couldn't possibly be so intolerant and hateful, because our ideology was famous for ACLU-type commitments to free speech, dissent and, especially, tolerance for those who differed with us." But that's delusional, to put it mildly. The left has been far less tolerant of dissent than the right over at least the last several decades, and has also been far more hateful in its intolerance. The Democratic Party that Davis imagines existed before the challenge to Lieberman never really existed. It was a fantasy.

Yet the vitriol -- and anti-Semitic vitriol in particular -- that has been so much a part of the Lieberman-Lamont contest appears to have awakened even the blissfully delusional Lanny Davis. And you can bet that he is not alone. After what was done to and said about Lieberman in this race, you can rest assured that there are scads of liberal American Jews who, like Davis, are no longer able to pretend that the Democratic Party is the party of tolerance, particularly tolerance of Jews.

The second column of interest ran on Wednesday. It was written by Thane Rosenbaum, the former "literary editor of *Tikkun* magazine, a leading voice for progressive Jewish politics," who currently teaches "human rights at a Jesuit university, imparting the lessons of reciprocal grievances and the moral necessity to regard all people with dignity and mutual respect." Rosenbaum, admits that he, like many Jewish liberals, has finally had to give in and accept reality, i.e., to concede that peace cannot simply be wished into existence. He wrote:

I am deeply sensitive to Palestinian pain, and mortified when innocent civilians are used as human shields and then cynically martyred as casualties of war.

Yet, since 9/11 and the second intifada, where suicide bombings and beheadings have become the calling cards of Arab diplomacy, and with Hamas and Hezbollah emerging as elected entities that, paradoxically, reject the first principles of liberal democracy, I feel a great deal of moral anguish. Perhaps I have been naïve all along.

And I am not alone. Many Jews are in my position -- the children and grandchildren of labor leaders, socialists, pacifists, humanitarians, antiwar protestors - - instinctively leaning left, rejecting war, unwilling to demonize, and insisting that violence only breeds more violence. Most of all we share the profound belief that killing, humiliation and the infliction of unnecessary pain are not Jewish attributes.

However, the world as we know it today -- post-Holocaust, post-9/11, post-sanity -- is not cooperating. Given the realities of the new Middle East, perhaps it is time for a reality check. For this reason, many Jewish liberals are surrendering to the mindset that there are no solutions other than to allow Israel to defend itself -- with whatever means necessary . . .

The Jewish left is now in shambles. Peace Now advocates have lost their momentum, and, in some sense, their moral clarity . . .

The recent disastrous events in Lebanon and Gaza have inadvertently created a newly united Jewish consciousness -- bringing right and left together into one deeply cynical red state.

Careful readers will note that while Mr. Rosenbaum's article addresses Israel and her defense specifically, he himself is an American professor at Fordham Law School. And he is deliberate in his word choice, referring repeatedly to the "Jewish left," as opposed to the "Israeli left." He thereby intimates that the

process he describes -- the process of waking up from Voegelin's Dream World -- is taking place among Jews *in the United States*. This is significant, and it is significant for a handful of reasons.

First, the process of accepting reality described here by Rosenbaum dovetails quite nicely with the similar process described previously by Lanny Davis. In both cases, what we have are liberal Jewish elites confessing that liberalism is not all that it's cracked up to be. For some time now, even since before 9/11, conservatives such as we have been predicting that the traditionally Democratic Jewish vote would eventually move rightward. Though the process has met with resistance and has thus moved more slowly than we initially anticipated, it seems possible that the combination of the Democratic purge of Joseph Lieberman and the Iranian- and Syrian-backed terrorist war against Israel will finally prove to be the proverbial back-breaking straw. At the very least, that's an entirely reasonable assumption based on the collective experiences and revelations described by Davis and Rosenbaum.

A second reason that Rosenbaum's capitulation to reality is significant is because it constitutes a nearly precise replication of a historical process that radically transfigured modern American politics. While today's Democrats and anti-warriors have thoroughly enjoyed bashing the dreaded "neocons," who, they believe, are responsible for all the world's evils, these critics appear to possess precious little understanding about the nature of neoconservatism and the political forces that fostered its genesis.

If Thane Rosenbaum is part of a larger group of Jews, and Jewish intellectuals in particular, who have awakened to the realities of geopolitics and who are therefore abandoning the left and its naïve fantasies, then he is also a part of a much larger intellectual tradition, a tradition founded by the likes of Norman Podhoretz and Irving Kristol, namely neoconservatism.

Recall that before it became the catch-all term of derision applied to anyone and everyone even remotely associated with the Bush administration and its

foreign policy, the word “neoconservative” described a specific group of people, those intellectuals (primarily, but not exclusively Jewish) who abandoned the old left because of its coddling of Soviet Communism. The neocons then (as well as now) advocated a muscular national security policy and decried liberalism’s delusions about the nature of war and peace. Though the contemporary, anti-war, anti-Bush left and the mainstream press have together done their very best to discredit the term and the movement, Rosenbaum’s admission demonstrates that the neoconservative tradition continues to have its adherents and, indeed, continues to gain adherents as liberalism remains steadfast in its determination to misjudge the nature of man.

Finally, the third reason that Rosenbaum’s essay is so important is because it hints at the possibility of a large-scale, extra-Jewish acquiescence to reality with regard to national security and defense matters. Allow us to explain.

One of the most deceptive aspects of the discussion about “neoconservatism” is the impression that the political beliefs and ideological conversions described by the term were limited to a handful of Jewish intellectuals. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Though they are rarely described as “neocons,” millions of Americans made the very same ideological journey from left to right as did Norman Podhoretz. And they made it at exactly the same time and for exactly the same reasons. The combination of the left’s denial of reality regarding national security and its embrace of radical anti-Americanism made the Democratic Party an inhospitable place not just for a handful of New York Jews, but for Alabama Baptists and Texas Methodists and Missouri Lutherans and a great many California atheists as well. Indeed, the attitudes and beliefs that robbed the old left of the Podhoretzes and Kristols also robbed it of the entire American South and much of the American West. They robbed the left of five of six presidential contests and its status as the nation’s majority ideology.

And if the process of ideological alienation and conversion is ongoing among Jewish intellectuals, as Rosenbaum’s column suggests, then there is reason

to believe that it is ongoing elsewhere in the broader population as well. Rosenbaum speaks for himself and, according to him, for “many Jewish liberals.” But history suggests that he speaks for thousands of other Americans as well.

And this brings us back to Lanny Davis. You see, as with Rosenbaum’s analysis, Davis’s piece touches on political trends with ramifications that extend beyond the American Jewish community and that may affect thousands of other Americans. Like Rosenbaum, Davis hints at the larger political trends that led to the demise of the Democrats as the majority party and provides evidence as well that these trends continue.

Of course, in this case, the important information is not found in the author’s analysis, but in the sanctimonious blather that precedes it. The fact of the matter is that Lanny Davis is a supercilious, patronizing bigot. His piece drips with condescension for conservatives (“This kind of scary hatred, my dad used to tell me, comes only from the right wing.” “I held on to the view that the left was inherently more tolerant and less hateful than the right.”). And whether he acknowledges it or not, his piece and his ideology drip with disdain for average Americans as well. Anyone, Davis implies, who doesn’t agree with him and his “ACLU-type commitments” is, by definition “hateful” or “bigoted.” Is it any wonder that Davis has, for so long been blind to the intolerance of the contemporary left, given that he admits to having embraced wholeheartedly the very same intolerance?

Davis rants about how shocked he is to discover that hatred and vitriol might exist outside of the confines of the conservative movement and, in so doing, provides yet another piece in the puzzle that depicts the Democrats’ fall from grace. The utter contempt of the left for the beliefs of average Americans is, without question, one of the key reasons that those Americans have eschewed the Democrats. And Davis provides evidence that this contempt is inexorable. “Hey, vote for me because I’m not as stupid or hateful as you are” has never been a particularly effective campaign slogan, yet Davis and his pretentious essay suggest that the Democrats are hardly ready to abandon it.

And so what we have here, between these two columns written by two prominent liberal American Jews and published last week by *The Wall Street Journal*, is a near-perfect microcosm of American political trends over the last four decades. We have the growing anti-Semitism of the contemporary left, the left's interminable denial of reality with regard to the nature of man and the nature of war, the left's unseriousness regarding the threats posed by a dangerous world, and the complete and total contempt by liberal elites for the majority of Americans and the beliefs they hold. If one were to write a book about American politics since, say, Vietnam, these trends would almost certainly comprise a sizeable chunk of the discussion. They explain quite nicely the demise of the Democrats and the rise of the Republicans over the last four decades.

More to the point, since there is evidence that all four trends continue, there is reason to believe that they also provide a reasonable foundation from which to forecast the fortunes of the respective parties over the next several decades. In the week since Ned Lamont

beat Joe Lieberman, there has been a great deal of discussion about the Democrats failing to learn from their mistakes and history repeating itself. But the fact of the matter is that history is not repeating itself. The trends that begat the destruction of the Democratic majority during the Cold War simply continue, if not unabated, then certainly with still considerable vigor. And there is reason to believe that the deleterious effect of these trends on the Democratic Party's political fortunes will continue as well.

We caution that none of this means that the Republicans are guaranteed to hold their majorities in this year's midterm elections. Indeed, if the professional pollsters and election soothsayers are to be believed, then the Democrats just may have one last hurrah. But over the long run, the Democrats continue to heap dirt on their own graves. By failing to identify, much less to rectify the mistakes that have led them into minority party status, they virtually guarantee that that status will remain unchanged for the foreseeable future.

Copyright 2006. 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.