



In terms of her retail political skills, she is not generally a warm person. I understand from her closest friends that she is a marvelously good person and makes a mean tossed salad and all of that. But she doesn't convey that.

Fourth: It has become mythology, and one to which I helped contribute, that she is more ideologically pure—that is to say, traditionally liberal—than her husband. The fact of the matter is she's been in lockstep with him for years on matters of policies and issues, ever since he adapted his instincts to the expedient course of remaining a governor in a somewhat conservative southern state.

She was with him when he, in order to pass his sales tax for education, hauled all the state's teachers in for a basic skills test, against resistance from the Left. Today, of course, she is warmly endorsed by the teachers' unions—part of the Clinton luck, and their ability to slide from one reality into another.

While Bill was adapting to the realities of the Reagan era, Hillary was maintaining her Left *bona fides* by her associations with the Children's Defense Fund and the Legal Services Corporation. But by the end of their time in Arkansas, she had moved to the corporate boardroom.

Her health-care initiative in Washington was not traditionally liberal. The traditional liberal plan would have been a single-payer system. Her massive bureaucratic approach reflected not liberalism so much as a controlling nature and a lawyerly attention to every possible contingency.

My fifth and final point is that Mrs. Clinton wants to be judged (as she judges others) by positions on political issues. Her answer to the "carpetbagger" question is, "Judge me not by where I'm from, but by what I say." What governmental programs you support reflects who you are, I think, in her view.

JOYCE MILTON: Preparing for this panel, I asked myself, "What is it about Hillary that makes her different from every other First Lady in history?" It isn't her marriage. There have been a lot of political wives who've had less than ideal marriages, including some in the White House. Jacqueline Kennedy, for instance, had a lot to put up with. The difference, of course, is that her problem never became our problem, whereas with the Clintons all of their problems become our problems eventually.

But there are differences that set Hillary apart. Most fundamentally, she's the first presidential spouse to see her years in the White House not as a privilege, not as an awesome responsibility to live up to, but rather as a platform, a career move, a chance to add to her résumé, to build her career for the future.

Hillary is distinguished by her hyperactivity. She's excessive in everything she does. You have to give her credit for being a hard worker. But I think if she just did a third as much, she would have higher approval ratings, and wouldn't have to be thinking about raising \$25 million to run for the Senate.

When you look at Mrs. Clinton's résumé you find very strange things. Her friends start telling you, well, she wasn't really responsible for that. She was just on the board for this other thing. And the résumé falls apart in your hands.

And many of the things she gets involved in end up being very controlling and controversial and troubling. For example,

in 1991 and '92, Hillary was very involved in education reform. In March 1992, she and Ira Magaziner wrote an article in the journal *Educational Leadership* arguing that the American economy couldn't keep up with Japan and Germany. They then presented nothing less than a plan to reorganize not only the whole American educational system but the entire U.S. economy.

We're going to get rid of the high school diploma, they said, and reorient everything toward vocational education, aiming at a certificate of competency by age 16. Skilled workers, as they go through life, will have to keep earning additional certificates, which will be administered by unelected state boards and regulatory agencies. Your name and certifications will go into a national labor data bank, in which all employers will be required by law to list all their available jobs, which will then be matched up to people.

Another corps of bureaucrats will go into workplaces and tell executives how to reorganize their factories and offices in order to use the skills that the certificate programs are producing. The employers will pay for this with a tax of 1 percent on their payroll. Quite a sweeping plan, all in the name of increasing productivity in the United States of America.

When pilot projects launched along these lines by Mario Cuomo and others failed miserably, suddenly this wasn't Hillary's idea. She was just recapitulating the ideas of others. Yet even after the New York pilot failures, Hillary's allies came up with an even more grandiose plan, with Hillary continuing to be listed on their literature as a co-chair for implementation. This is just one line among many on her résumé that the general public never hears about.

For Hillary, a massive manipulation of U.S. schools and workplaces was just another project. As with the failure of her convoluted health care plan, when her moment as policy czar passed, she just put that in the background.

But the question is: Does she really still believe these sorts of centralized, grossly controlling schemes would be a good idea? I think she does. All she has learned—and this is what she means when she says that she's a New Democrat and a moderate—is that you can't push these big plans through all at once. So now she's running in New York as a mild and even-tempered candidate.

I don't see the many social engineering plans in Hillary's background as left-wing so much as I see them as a kind of corporate fascism. They would give the government, in league with favored large industries, the power to decide who does what and how and why.

Of course the irony is that when it came time to act, Hillary's own health care task force couldn't even organize chairs for people to sit on at meetings, or manage their own travel vouchers or their budget, or avoid breaking federal regulations

**I don't see
the many
social
engineering
plans in
Hillary's
background
as left-wing
so much
as I see
them as
a kind
of corporate
fascism.**

—JOYCE MILTON

and laws. Their theory of "managed competition" was ginned up by a staff of people who didn't even believe in competition, or understand how it could possibly lower prices. So that was a fizzle.

Then in 1994, barely months after these heady attempts to remake great swathes of American society, Hillary Clinton was under legal scrutiny for various financial and ethical scandals. And suddenly she turned into the Pretty in Pink lady, who couldn't understand commodities trading, or how a real-estate option worked.

After she got over that hump, her office announced at the beginning of the second Clinton administration that Hillary's number-one project was going to be community development banks. They created an agency over at the Treasury Department, and there was a lot of pressure from the White House to give out grants, though it turned out no proper evaluation procedure had ever been set up. So the lion's share of the money simply went to institutions with which Hillary had long associations.

When Congress asked questions about this, the fellow in charge went back and wrote the evaluations up, and backdated them. He was caught and had to resign. Though Mrs. Clinton's office had claimed this was her number-one project, when it collapsed, Hillary suddenly had nothing to do with the initiative at all.

These same sorts of dodges and transformations have followed each of her political failures, and I expect we're going to keep seeing the pattern so long as Mrs. Clinton remains active in political life.

DAVID BROCK: No presidential spouse before Hillary Clinton has been so vital to the policy direction and the political survival of her husband. She'll be remembered as a First Lady who really broke the mold: as a professional spouse and working mother with her own office in the West Wing of the White House; as the first presidential spouse in history to assume a formal government post in leading the health-care initiative; and as the informal and perhaps someday formal head of the liberal wing of the Democratic Party.

First Ladies have always played some role in guiding their husbands in staffing the White House, and have sometimes adopted special causes of their own. But Mrs. Clinton exercises considerably more influence than her predecessors. Never before has a First Lady had direct influence over political appointments across the executive branch as she has.

Her goals have also been considerably more ambitious than those of her predecessors. They have extended beyond merely helping her husband or crafting her own image to advancing social and political causes in which she deeply believes—in other words, her own agenda.

It's conventional to attribute the political problems of the Clinton administration's first couple of years to Hillary, and I