

By David Horowitz

Hillary Rodham Clinton *and* **The Third Way**

I would argue Hillary Clinton is America's foremost leftist. This is not obvious even to conservatives. My friend Peggy Noonan in her new book, *The Case Against Hillary Clinton*, skewers Mrs. Clinton not for her kitsch Marxism, but for her narcissism. "Never has the admirable been so fully wedded to the appalling," she writes of Hillary and her faithless rooster husband. "Never in modern political history has such tenacity and determination been marshaled to achieve such puny purpose: the mere continuance of Them."

But there are lots of unprincipled narcissists in politics. There has never before, however, been a White House so thoroughly penetrated by the Left as the Clintons' is. If Hillary and Bill Clinton were unable to draw on the Left's faith and support, there would be no prospect of a "continuance of Them."

Ever since I left behind the utopian illusions of the progressive cause myself, I have been struck by how little the rest of the world actually understands the Left. Those who have never been inside the movement are often unable to grasp the ruthlessness and cynicism that lurks behind its idealistic mask.

I was a Marxist in the 1960s, and was involved—as were Hillary Clinton and all progressives of the era—in making excuses for violent radicals like the Black Panthers. We did this then, as progressives still do, in the name of "social justice." This became a powerful license for us. If you felt your mission was to lead the unenlightened to a better world, why would you tell a truth others cannot understand?

The heart of what it means to be on the Left is to see yourself as a social redeemer. This is the most satisfying form of narcissism. That is why Leftists do not care that all their socialist schemes have gone up in flames when actually put into practice, causing more human misery than any of the injustices they launched their crusades against. That is why they never learn from their experience, why the continuance of Them is more important than any truth or progress.

The intoxicating vision of a social redemption is at the heart of the "social gospel" that Hillary Clinton imbibed at the United Methodist Church in Park Ridge, Illinois, then later in the New Left at Yale, and in the Venceremos Brigade in socialist Cuba. It is the idea that drives her lifelong comrades at the Children's Defense Fund, the offices of Legal Services, the National Organization for Women, the Al Sharpton House of Justice, and the other progressive causes that see her as their leader.

For these self-appointed redeemers, "social justice" is not about rectifying particular injustices. That would be too pragmatic and limited a concern. Rather, Hillary and her allies aim to rectify injustice in the very order of things. They aim for a world structured in a boldly new way—a world in which everyone is equally advantaged and without fundamental conflicting desires. This is, of course, a world that could only come into being through a God-like remaking of human nature and society.

*T*oday the Left has been temporarily chastened by its epic defeats, and has adjusted its sights. It now seeks power incrementally, through the democratic process, through the "Third Way," as Bill and Hillary Clinton and their British friend Tony Blair, among others, put it.

But no matter how opportunistically its agendas have been adjusted, no matter how pragmatically its goals have been set, no matter how generous its rhetorical concessions, the progressive Left has not given up its quasi-religious idea of a world transformed. And this transformation requires the saints' permanent entrenchment in power. Therefore, everything is justified that serves to achieve the continuance of Them.

If you read Peggy Noonan's portrait of Hillary Clinton, you can trace the outlines of this worldview. Noonan describes Clinton-era "liberalism" as a creed that, much more than preceding versions,

David Horowitz is president of the Center for the Study of Popular Culture.

is manipulative and deceptive and not really interested in what the people think because, as she puts it, “they might think the wrong thing.”

That is why Hillary Clinton’s famous health care plan was the work of a cabal that shrouded itself in secrecy to the point of illegality. Noonan calls this “command and control liberalism,” a Clinton-era phrase with a totalitarian ring. But like so many conservatives, Noonan is finally too decent to fully comprehend the pathology she is dealing with.

She quotes Richard Nixon that only two kinds of people run for high office in America, “those who want to do big things and those who want to be big people.” She identifies both Clintons as “very much, perhaps completely, the latter sort.”

Regarding Bill Clinton, Noonan is probably right. I don’t think he’s a leftist driven by ideas of a socially just world. He is probably better understood as a borderline sociopath, wholly absorbed in the ambitions of self, who has taken on the coloration of his leftist environment and the constituencies on which his political fortunes have come to depend. In my view, Hillary Clinton is different. She reveals an ideological spine that constantly creates political difficulties for her, a sure sign of its existence.

Noonan implies that if they were principled emissaries of a political cause, the Clintons would seek to do big things for America. Because they do not, “they have made the American political landscape a lower and lesser thing.” They have “behaved as though they are justified in using any tactic in pursuit of their goals,” including illegalities, deceptions, libels, threats, and “ruining the lives of perceived enemies.”

“They believe they are justified in using any means to achieve their ends for a simple and uncomplicated reason,” she concludes. “It is that they are superior individuals whose gifts and backgrounds entitle them to leadership.” They do it for themselves, for the continuance of Them.

But the fact is, all progressives do this. The missionaries of the redeemed social future, including prominent feminists like Steinem, Ireland, Michelman, and Friedan, all tossed their feminist principles overboard to give Bill Clinton a pass on multiple sexual harassments—because he was their link to power.

**Hillary
Clinton
craves the
power to
redeem
the world.
For her,
that noble end
justifies
all the
sordid means.**

Noonan is right that the focus of Hillary Clinton’s ambition is not her country. Instead, Hillary is focused on a place that does not exist, but in her mind can be achieved, if only the carriers of its future can gather enough power to make it real. That is why Hillary Clinton and her henchman Sidney Blumenthal call the core of their politics “the Third Way.”

The Third Way comes from the lexicon of the Left with a long, dishonorable pedigree. In the 1930s, Nazis used it to characterize their own brand of national socialism as a Third Way between the “internationalist” socialism of the Soviet bloc and the capitalism of the democracies of the West. Trotskyites used the Third Way as a term to distinguish their Marxism from Stalinism and from the capitalist democracies of the West. In the 1960s, New Leftists used the Third Way to define their politics as a socialism situated between the Soviet bloc and the capitalist democracies of the West.

But as the history of Nazism and Trotskyism and the New Left has shown, there is no Third Way. There is the democratic capitalist way, based on private property and individual rights, a way that leads to liberty and universal opportunity, and there is the socialist way of group identities, group rights, relentless growth of the state, restricted liberties, and diminished opportunities. The Third Way is just a suspension between these two destinations. It is not a goal in itself. It is a bad faith attempt to escape the taint that the Left’s actual achievements have earned.

Bill Clinton is a narcissist who is willing to sacrifice ideological principle for power because his vision is so filled with himself that he can no longer tell the difference. But those who serve him most loyally—the Harold Ickes, the feminists, the progressives, and, most of all, his wife Hillary Rodham Clinton—can tell the difference. They ride along for a very different reason: because they crave power to redeem the world. And for them, that noble end justifies all the sordid means.

FIRST LADY, continued from page 26

seem to lack any shame or concept that they have to deal with their own problems. So their problems become our problems.

And of course, they attack. It’s a feature of the narcissistic personality to see all criticisms as coming from enemies, people who are plotting against you. Hillary does have this. She might have said, “Maybe I went a little overboard when I blamed these Monica stories on a vast right-wing conspiracy, because it turns out now there was something to it.” Just a little word of recognition that she got carried away would have made a healing impression. Instead, she compares herself to Jesus, who forgave St. Peter.

Part of her problem was that she came on so strong in the beginning. There was this feeling that it was a co-presidency,

which we didn’t ask for or vote for. And partly it’s just her abrasive personality. She’s bossy, and a lot of people have trouble with that.

It’s a typical Hillary move to run for Senate in a state where she has never lived. Instead of taking her time and preparing the way for a Senate bid, she just charged in.

I question whether it’s a move for independence, because these are people who always seem to be having problems and are on the verge of divorce every two or three years, yet they always make up in time for the next election. I see that same cycle occurring here again. Now that Hillary is running, they seem to be getting along a little better. Perhaps this will save the marriage.



America's Startling New

Urban Geography

In 1902, H. G. Wells wrote, “Already for a great number of businesses it is no longer necessary that the office should be in London, and only habit, tradition, and minor consideration keep them there.” By the telephone and the post office parcel service “almost all the labor of ordinary shopping can be avoided.... The mistress of the house has all her local tradesmen, all the great London shops, the circulating library, theater box-office, the post-office and cab-rank, the nurse inst. and the doctor within reach of her hand.”

Wells was prescient to see a hundred years ago that new technologies would disperse across the landscape the amenities once available only to city dwellers. The United States is decentralizing faster than any other society in history. Fifteen of the largest 25 cities have lost 4 million people since 1965, while the nation's total population has risen by 60 million. But at the same time that the large “vertical cities” have lost population, mid-sized horizontal cities, better adapted to the automobile and better able to offer a quality of life comparable to the suburbs, have grown rapidly.

In the age of horizontal high-tech cities, Austin now has a larger population than Boston, while Denver, once a provincial mining and oil town, has emerged, thanks to the cable industry, as a major metropolis. If Austin is now larger than Boston, that is because the high-tech economy has created more new jobs in Texas over the past two years than in the entire oil and gas extraction industry.

On the conventional map of America leftover from the urban age, the city of Baltimore—home of glorious Camden Yards and the Orioles—looms large in its region. In fact Baltimore is

now only the fourth-largest political jurisdiction in Maryland; high-tech Montgomery County on the outskirts of Washington, D.C., has both more jobs and more people. Similarly, San Francisco has become something of a suburb to Silicon Valley. It is now the second-largest city in the Bay Area, with 300,000 fewer people than San Jose and fewer than 50 of the Bay Area's 500 largest public companies. In Northern Virginia, suburban Fairfax County is now home to nearly a million people, and possesses over twice the office space of downtown Boston, Philadelphia, Houston, Denver, Dallas, or Seattle. In fact, it has more office space than all but four of America's cities.

Let's take a look at Philadelphia and its suburbs: The leading industrial center in Pennsylvania is not Pittsburgh or Philadelphia but Montgomery County in suburban Philly. Its 725,000 citizens on the edge of Philadelphia make it more populous than five states, and also give it the highest per-capita income in the state. Its 500,000 jobs (up from 387,000 in 1990) draw in 250,000 commuters daily from as far away as Allentown and Reading—it's like a dispersed center city. Montgomery together with Chester County to its east are now the economic engines of the region. Together they have not only a larger population than Philly but 110,000 more private-sector jobs. Or as William H. Fulton, executive director of the Chester County Planning Commission, puts it, “There's a lot of people out here who don't like to hear that Chester County is a suburb of Philadelphia.”

Not only has Philly's western suburban economy surpassed that of its big-city neighbor to the east, but employment in these towns now exceeds the total in major metropolitan areas like New Orleans, Memphis, Buffalo, and Richmond. The western