



by Grover G. Norquist

# The Coming Bush Dynasty

It will flourish if it knocks down key Clinton pillars.

**E**ight years ago, I wrote an article entitled “The Coming Clinton Dynasty.” It rebutted the hope that Bill Clinton would be another Jimmy Carter, destined to defeat in 1996 by Reagan II.

Sadly, I was correct. Carter believed that he and the Great Society liberals were the natural governing majority. Clinton knew his party represented a minority. Carter thought he could win a fair re-election. Clinton would ensure that the rules were changed to avoid defeat in 1996.

The secret of Clinton’s success was not “triangulation” or “moderation,” but a sustained effort to change the rules. In January 1993, he rescinded the Bush executive order enforcing the Supreme Court’s *Beck* decision that prohibits unions from using coerced union dues for politics. The Supreme Court had ruled 7-2 in 1989 that much of the union money spent on politics is not legally raised. But Clinton refused to enforce the law of the land banning coerced union dues in politics. He might not have won in 1996 if he had followed the law.

Clinton then signed the “Motor Voter” law, requiring all states to liberalize their voter registration lists. Democrats voted down amendments that would have allowed states to purge from the rolls the names of those who had died or moved. Motor Voter facilitated voter fraud. If serious efforts by states to stem voter fraud had not been blocked, Woody Jenkins would today represent Louisiana in the Senate instead of Mary Landrieu. Without

Motor Voter the 2000 election would not have been close.

During the Clinton-Gore years, federal funds flowed like wine to labor unions, environmental groups, and other liberal lobbying organizations. The trial lawyers were allowed to pillage the economy as Clinton vetoed all efforts at tort reform. Billions of federal contract dollars and billions in extracted tobacco funds went to those who kicked back tens of millions to Democratic candidates.

It was enough to give Clinton a second term. It was almost enough to steal the 2000 election.

President George W. Bush will benefit from a Republican majority in the House of Representatives that has now been elected four times and a Senate that is balanced 50-50 with Vice President Dick Cheney able to cast the deciding vote. The Democrats hope that an outraged base will sweep them back into control of the House and Senate in 2002 and restore the interrupted Clinton-Gore dynasty. But Bush now has the incentive to level the playing field by stripping the Democrats of their ill-gotten gains. To do that he’ll have to shake the Democrats’ five pillars.

The first is labor unions, which raise \$8 billion a year from 16 million union members paying an average of \$500 dues. The Supreme Court found that 80 percent of union dues were not allowable under *Beck*. When Bush re-establishes workers’ rights through executive orders and appointments to the Labor Department and National Labor Relations Board, it will cost the labor bosses \$400 for every worker who opts out. Thirty-six percent of union members voted for Bush. If only ten percent exercise their

*Beck* rights and keep their \$400, labor bosses will lose \$640 million a year.

Under Clinton-Gore, the Labor Department became the property of the AFL-CIO. Each year, up to \$3 billion in contracts goes to labor unions, often without bid. Since unions represent only 12 percent of American workers, an uncorrupted Labor Department would give unions at most 14 percent of such contracts. If the private sector paid for its own job training programs, taxpayers would keep the billions now sent to unions for recirculation in political kickbacks to Democrats. Even modest reform of the Labor Department’s spending could cost the labor bosses \$1 billion a year.

Under Clinton-Gore, tens of millions of dollars flowed to left-wing groups through HUD, HHS, and the Department of Education. These taxpayer-funded lobbies are the second pillar of the Democratic Party. Funding earmarked to promote hunting and outdoor sports has been redirected to animal rights groups. The National Council of Senior Citizens, which started life as Senior Citizens for Kennedy-Johnson, receives \$70 million each year in federal funds and actively endorses liberal Democrats. After eight corrupt years, it’s unlikely there is a single government agency whose budget has not been used to benefit the left. A competent OMB working with cabinet officers and committee staff can put a foot on this air hose.

Modest tort reform would deprive pillar number three—greedy trial lawyers—of billions from American consumers. In some states trial lawyers give more to Democrats than union leaders do. Candidate Bush was a consistent advocate of tort reform. But as payback to their trial lawyer backers Democrats will certainly filibuster most tort reform.

Big City political machines provide a fourth pillar. Clinton fought hard to insist

GROVER G. NORQUIST is president of Americans for Tax Reform.

that federal funds to “help the poor” flow first to mayors and Democrat precinct workers and only then to the needy. This is the left’s version of “trickle-down economics.” Whether for housing, education, vocational training, Medicaid or Medicare, vouchers are unpopular on the left because they cut out party middlemen. Bush and a Republican Congress need only insist that funds promised to the poor actually reach the poor to defund the Democrat machines that deliver the votes in Detroit, Chicago, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and St. Louis.

Voter fraud is the fifth pillar of the Democratic Party. The whole 36-day circus in Florida was designed to give the local politicians in Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach counties a chance to manufacture or find enough Gore votes, or lose or damage enough Bush votes, to overcome Bush’s margin. Although the effort failed, it is estimated that 5,000 felons, mostly Democrats, voted illegally in Florida, and we may never know how many illegal aliens voted.

Democrats fought to keep overseas and military ballots, which trend Republican, from counting in Florida and other states. They also fought to keep dead, moved, and non-citizen names on the voting rolls. Felons who voted on November 7 committed another felony and violated their parole or probation terms; resident aliens or illegal aliens who were told to vote have committed a crime that could get them deported; students who voted at school and by absentee at their parents’ address, like those in Wisconsin, should by rights go to prison rather than back to school next fall.

All these efforts must be defeated if Bush is to win in 2004. The focus on ballot integrity in Florida should remind Americans that while they must show a picture ID to cash a check or fly on an airline, most states impose no such obligation on voters.

Perhaps President Bush should announce a three-month amnesty for anyone who engaged in voter fraud. Violators streaming in for amnesty would generate three months of headlines, meaning the left could never again laugh about it or suggest it doesn’t matter. Reform would then be unstoppable. Federal legislation could allow states to drop felons, dead people, and non-citizens from registration rolls.

After the amnesty period the law should be fully enforced. The federal computer file of all felons—developed by liberals to enforce the Brady Bill prohibiting felons from buying firearms—can be checked against the list of those who vote. No one need go to jail if he comes forward during the amnesty.

Even if voter fraud cannot be ended it can be contained. The advantage of the Electoral College is that the mayor of Chicago cannot invent three million additional votes and steal the national election. He can only steal the electoral votes of Illinois. But we can provide further protection. States can adopt the Nebraska/Maine rules that apportion electoral votes by congressional district. The candidate who wins the whole state gets two electoral votes plus one electoral vote for each congressional district he carries.

If the GOP-dominated state legislatures and GOP governors in New Jersey, Michigan, and Pennsylvania adopted Nebraska/Maine rules, it would prevent voter fraud in Newark, Detroit, and Philadelphia from overwhelming the rest of the state. With winner-take-all in New Jersey, Michigan, and Pennsylvania Gore won 50 electoral votes. But Bush won 25 congressional districts in these three states—enough to have won the election without Florida.

New Jersey State Senator Joe Kyrillos, Jr. is already preparing such legislation. Bush would not have ignored New Jersey if he thought he could win seven or more congressional districts, and Republicans might not have lost a Senate seat to millionaire Jon Corzine.

Could Democrats use this model to hurt Republicans in other states? Democrats control the governorship and state legislature in five states carried by Bush in 2000: Georgia, West Virginia, North Carolina, Alabama, and Mississippi. If those states adopted the Nebraska/Maine law, Gore would have gained only 9 electoral votes.

Democrats hoping to gain House seats in 2002—they only need five more to take the House—learned on election night they had lost the House for the next 12 years. Redistricting will take effect in time for the 2002 elections. Ten House seats will be lost by Connecticut (1), New York (2), Illinois (1), Mississippi (1), Wisconsin (1), Ohio (1), Oklahoma (1), and Pennsylvania (2). Ten

will be gained by Texas (2), Nevada (1), Florida (1), Georgia (2), California (1), Colorado (1), and Arizona (2). Gore states lose six seats. Bush states gain eight.

Redistricting should cost the Democrats ten or more seats in 2002. In 2000 a number of Democrats delayed retirement plans at Dick Gephardt’s request. There were nine Democrats and 24 Republican retirements in 2000. Despite new open-seat advantages and the power of the White House, Democrats gained only two additional House seats last fall. The prospect of another 12 years in the minority will increase Democratic retirements in 2002.

The Democrats’ Senate hopes are tempered by the realization that in 2000 they were competing with Republican senators who won in the Gingrich landslide of 1994. In 2002, they are up against 20 Republican senators who won despite the Clinton tide of 1996.

Other trends bode well for Republicans. The number of Americans investing in the stock market will continue to grow. In July 2000 the House of Representatives voted 401 to 25 to expand the availability of 401(k)s and IRAs. Polls show that Americans of all ages, incomes, and races become more Republican and more conservative when they own stocks.

Americans who turned 21 during the Democratic years 1932-1952 are now 69 to 89 years old. They’ve kept their Democratic leanings, as voters over 70 went 51-43 for Gore over Bush. But each year, 2 million members of that age cohort die, resulting in a net annual loss of 160,000 Democratic voters. By 2004 that will mean 640,000 fewer Gore voters. Meanwhile, the INS will not spend the next four years pushing through the naturalization of immigrants with criminal records, as it did under Clinton-Gore.

Restoring simple honesty to government will break the five pillars of the Democratic Party. Without their artificial support, that party will shrink to its traditional voting strength—i.e., under Humphrey (43 percent), McGovern (38 percent), Carter in 1980 (41 percent), Mondale (41 percent), and Clinton in 1992 (43 percent).

If the Bush team is as serious and unflinching over the next four years as it was in the battle for Florida, then we have seen the last close presidential election for a long time. ❀



# Halfway Measures

Lacking convictions, Hollywood can't display courage.

John Leland, a writer for the *New York Times*, claims to believe that the new Bush presidency portends a change in the national mood. "Like dogs and their owners," he writes, "nations often resemble their leaders." And after eight years of what he describes as a "workaholic frenzy" under Clinton-Gore—something that the vice president's frenetic style of campaigning threatened to continue—Leland believes that the American people are looking forward to a good long rest with George W. "If this man stands for anything, surely it is for working only as hard as he has to," Leland writes.

A big part of the work force that entered the Clinton years afraid of never getting on the economic treadmill now dreams of getting off. People entering the job market now say they would rather have more time than more money. Even kids are burned out. A recent Harvard admissions paper described applicants as "dazed survivors of some bewildering lifelong boot camp." The Piscataway, N.J., school board declared a moratorium on excessive homework.

Like failed or disgraced politicians who claim that they are leaving office "to spend more time with my family," we try to put the best face we can on our new slothfulness. But even though Leland's piece was written with tongue in cheek, there is some evidence both from the leading economic indicators and from the recent crop of Christmas movies that he is on to something. In *Cast Away*, for instance, Tom

JAMES BOWMAN, our movie critic, is American editor of the *Times Literary Supplement*.

Hanks plays a gung-ho FedEx employee who exhorts his co-workers to remember that "we live and die by time" and urges them not to "commit the sin of turning our back on time." But when a plane crashes and he is cast up on a desert island as its sole survivor, he learns to take quite a different view of time. In *Proof of Life* a yuppie American couple in South America learn what is really important in their lives when the husband, played by David Morse, is taken hostage by guerrillas and his wife, played by Meg Ryan, has to try to get him back without help from government or his employers. In *The Family Man*, Nicolas Cage plays a high-living bachelor and Wall Street mergers-and-acquisitions specialist who wakes up one Christmas morning to find that he is a tire salesman in New Jersey, working for his father-in-law and married to his college sweetheart. He learns to like it.

Yet none of these movies is unambiguous in its appeal to more humane or family-centered virtues than those of mere acquisition. *Cast Away*, directed by Robert Zemeckis, raises the subject of the time-obsessed workaholic only to drop it again in favor of such more interesting matters as Mr. Hanks's character's various survival strategies and his ultimate homecoming to a fiancée (Helen Hunt) who, thinking him dead, has married another. So far as we can tell, his post-castaway existence is still to be lived as a FedEx employee and so is unlikely to be all that different from what it was before his life-changing experience. Miss Ryan's character in Taylor Hackford's *Proof of Life* at first wants her husband back very much, but as she begins to fall for the hostage negotiator (Russell Crowe) she has employed to get him back—in real life as in

the movie, so the gossip columns tell us—the focus naturally shifts to the sexual tension between them rather than the family values the movie sets out to promote.

The most striking example of an ambiguous message is provided by *The Family Man*, written by David Diamond and David Weissman and directed by Brett Ratner, which is a sort of cross between *Groundhog Day* and *It's a Wonderful Life*. It might have been as good as those two films, too, but for the sour note it strikes in leading Mr. Cage's character, Jack Campbell, even in its family-friendly version as father, husband, and tire salesman, back into the big money by staging a completely hokey meeting with a Wall Street colleague of the other Jack whose Rolls Royce gets a flat tire as he happens to be driving in New Jersey. True, despite his pinning for the old affluence, Jack offers to give it up for his now-beloved wife (Tea Leoni), who rather improbably doesn't fancy leaving New Jersey for a luxury apartment in Manhattan and private schools for the kids. But it is a rather querulous point, it seems to me—as if the filmmakers are saying that a man shouldn't *have* to make such a choice. He ought—and we ought—to be able to have it all.

So are the human ties of home and hearth the most important things in life or not? All three movies more or less explicitly set out to say that they are, but none of them quite has the courage of its convictions. Hollywood, though subject to occasional bouts of nostalgia, is politically unsympathetic. Clearly, nobody wants to be seen as sticking up too fervently for the *traditional* family in which the wife (you may remember) was supposed to be subordinate to her breadwinner husband, and was expected to stay at home with the children. Neither of the characters played by Miss Hunt and Miss Ryan has any chil-