

## 1: Democrats have massive lead as November elections approach, says new political poll | TheBlaze

*Nov 03, Â· Democrats lead in House preferences, but positive views of the economy and concern about border security may buoy Republicans, poll finds according to a new Washington Post-ABC News national.*

To this end, New Democracy pursues a three-part strategy: Convening elected leaders to develop an innovative governing platform for Democrats in and Supporting candidates for local, state and federal office who can win in places Democrats have been losing. Organizing a grassroots network of citizen allies for pragmatic Democratic leaders, ideas and candidates. Democratic strength is confined to big cities and coastal states. Democratic weakness is a problem for our country, not just our party. We have traded intensity of support among minorities, millennials, single women and secular voters for breadth of support across the whole electorate. To lead America, we must expand the party. Their successes highlight the kind of problem-solving pragmatism and crossover appeal that can help Democrats regain competitiveness everywhere. Along with fresh faces, Democrats urgently need fresh thinking. Unlike party consultants, interest groups and ideologues, they have to face actual voters who often want contradictory things and rarely display philosophical constancy. Where We Stand Democrats have many electoral assets. Voters trust the party more on important issues like health care, education and environmental protection, civil rights and standing up for the middle class. We should build on these strengths, but bringing new voters into our coalition also requires facing and fixing some basic electoral liabilities. New Democracy will focus on four strategic imperatives for rebuilding progressive majorities: Citizens in rural areas and small towns increasingly seem to inhabit a different moral universe than city dwellers. Republicans are the worst offenders, but both parties have indulged in a civically corrosive form of identity politics. To enlarge their appeal, Democrats must work harder to transcend these class and cultural divisions. Listening, reasoning, empathizing and searching for common ground is integral to a new politics of persuasion. On immigration, for example, Democrats should stick to their guns in supporting a humane path to legalization. Most important, we need to engage voters where they live and refrain from writing any off. Even in the toughest places, rural communities and small towns, Democrats should show up and make our case. Reclaim economic hope and progress Rather than compete with Trump in telling working people how miserable they are, Democrats need a more hopeful story about the new economy we want to build. That story would go something like this: We are well into an historic transformation from an industrial to a knowledge economy. Shaped largely by American ingenuity and technological prowess, the knowledge economy holds the promise of better, more interesting jobs for ourselves and our children. Our answer should be to spur more economic innovation to create new jobs and to raise productivity and wages so that working families can share in a new era of American prosperity. This will require big changes in public policy: Democrats should seize the high ground of economic aspiration and upward mobility. Rather than centering on economic victimhood and business-bashing, our narrative should inspire confidence in power of a free people to innovate, reinvent their economy and adopt progressive policies to equip everyone to get ahead in the knowledge age. The implications for Democrats are huge: Even when voters approve of our policy goals, they are deeply skeptical of the means by which we propose to achieve them. Washington is mired in bureaucratic bloat as well as political dysfunction. Unfortunately, the Obama years were a missed opportunity to use new technologies to modernize the vast federal apparatus and move it toward higher performance. As polarization has nearly paralyzed our national government, and as ponderous federal bureaucracies fail to deal with the quickened pace of life in the digital age, Americans increasingly are looking to local governments to get things done. Mayors and metro coalitions are spurring investment in new jobs and businesses; pioneering public-private partnerships to build modern infrastructure; investing in clean energy, and laying the foundations for driverless vehicles; using technology to cut through bureaucratic barriers and empower low-income people directly; and, by ushering in a new, 21st Century model for public schools. Close the security gap On questions of personal and national security, Republicans have long held the advantage. The public sees Republicans as better able to protect us from terrorism, and also gives the GOP the edge on keeping our military strong, patriotism and law and order. That means putting

security first in thought and deed. During our national convention, not one speaker mentioned national security on the first day. The administration has gratuitously alienated and alarmed our allies by questioning the value of the Atlantic Alliance. All this presents Democrats with ripe targets of opportunity. We should affirm not only the strategic value of our alliances, but also the animating principle of liberal internationalism â€” that a freer world is a safer world for America. Our party should stand resolutely against the tide of illiberal nationalism that is sweeping and destabilizing the world. We should give no quarter to Islamist terrorists who threaten our citizens and those of other civilized countries. And Democrats should lose no opportunity to demonstrate our resolve to keep our armed forces strong and qualitatively superior to those of potential adversaries.

## 2: Economic Policy Issues See Decline In Public Importance

*New Democrats support a pro-growth, pro-worker trade agenda that puts American jobs first. We need to set the rules for the global economy, not have them set by others. In doing so, the United States should focus on championing the economy of the future, not the economy of 50 years ago.*

Economic issues — improving the job situation, strengthening the economy and reducing the budget deficit — are viewed as less important policy priorities than they were just a few years ago. Other issues, which had been less prominent public priorities in the past, have grown in importance. A new national survey by Pew Research Center of 1,000 adults, conducted Jan. 12-15, 2014. These shifts come as attitudes about the economy and jobs availability have become more positive. Republicans and Democrats agree on the importance of some priorities. About half of both Republicans and Democrats say each should be top policy priorities. However, there continue to be wide gaps about the importance of other policy objectives — especially dealing with climate change and protecting the environment. There are sizable partisan differences on several other issues as well. Democrats are about 20 points more likely than Republicans to rate dealing with the poor and needy, dealing with race relations and improving the education system as top priorities. There is no overlap in the highest rated priorities for each party: For Republicans, the leading goals are defending against terrorism, strengthening the economy and strengthening the U.S. That remains the case today. More Democrats say climate change and environment are top priorities. The shares of Democrats saying that dealing with global climate change and protecting the environment have increased substantially in recent years. By contrast, attitudes among Republicans have largely held steady. The share of Democrats saying this is higher than at any point in the last decade and has increased nine points in the past year alone and 19 points since January. The goal of addressing drug addiction has increased in importance among members of both parties. While the goal of dealing with drug addiction has grown in importance for members of both parties, there has been a sharp increase in the percentage of Republicans rating improving roads and public transportation as a top priority. Opinions have changed less among Democrats, who had previously been more likely than Republicans to view this as a top priority. Age and policy priorities The policy priorities of young people and older Americans differ in several key respects. Older adults are significantly more likely to prioritize strengthening the military, making the Social Security system financially sound and dealing with drug addiction issues. Education and policy priorities Those with the lowest levels of education are more likely than those with higher levels to say a wide range of issues should be top priorities for the president and Congress. A similar pattern is seen when it comes to improving the job situation: Those with no college experience are more likely than those with a college degree or higher to say several other issues should be top priorities, including strengthening the military, dealing with drug addiction and strengthening the economy. Reducing the influence of lobbyists and special interest groups in Washington is the only issue that those with a college degree or higher prioritize more than those with no college experience: As noted, economic issues have declined somewhat in importance as the economy has improved. And the public has placed increasing importance on environmental issues. On several other issues — including reducing crime, securing the finances of Social Security and Medicare and dealing with the problems of the poor and needy — there has been relatively little change over time. On the other hand, dealing with global trade issues has been among the lowest-ranked priorities over the past two decades.

## 3: The Myth of the New Democrats

*New Democracy is a "home base" and support network for pragmatic Democratic leaders - governors, mayors, state officials and Members of Congress. Its mission is to expand the party's appeal across Middle America and make Democrats competitive everywhere.*

They preach the same brand of conservative politics that has run this country into the ground. It is the signal that the media is ready to collaborate. The great PR success story of the s was the "supply-siders. So it is with the "New Democrats. Closer to reality, the term reflects a confused attempt to bring intellectual respectability to the moderate-conservative coalition that has ruled Washington for most of the past 25 years. There is a great deal of overlap between New Democrats and those politicians who used to be known on Capitol Hill as Boll Weevils-- southerners who rose to committee chairmanships as Democrats and voted like Republicans. Southern conservatives who favor big business and expensive military budgets while opposing social spending are hardly new. They have been a fixture in the party even longer than big-city northeastern liberals. But all New Democrats are not southerners. And those who sell their political wares under the New Democrat label insist they are an entirely new political phenomenon. In a June 6, , Washington Post op-ed, Al From, director of the Democratic Leadership Council DLC , which holds the principal copyright on the New Democrat label, tells us their opinions add up to "a new public philosophy--a synthesis of progressive ideas and a nonbureaucratic approach to governing, grounded in mainstream values. It is both, and it is different. But their reach to establish a new ideology far exceeds their intellectual grasp. When faced with such central public problems as falling real incomes, impoverished cities, uncompetitive industries, and stubbornly high unemployment, their vision falters. Like their own caricature of the Left, the New Democrats are trapped in a "politics of evasion," obsessed with abstract debates over social values, while the nation stumbles into decline. The promise of being beyond left and right has perennial appeal in American politics. As George Lodge of the Harvard Business School pointed out years ago, we are among the most ideological of peoples, yet the conventions of American political life hold that politicians must present themselves as nonideological problem solvers. Ideological rigidity is not helpful in a complex, changing world, and liberals and conservatives can learn from each other. Moreover, there is a case for a posture of pragmatism; in any election, 35 to 40 percent of the electorate is locked into one party or the other; the contest is for the middle. Not surprisingly, most candidates for president present themselves as more "centrist" than the mainstream of their party. So there is a useful role for honest "plague on both your houses" politics in America. But those who carry the intellectual baggage for the Democratic Leadership Council do not curse the House of Liberalism and the House of Conservatism with equal fervor. For them, liberals are clearly the enemy. These ideas will bring back "Bubba"--the stereotype of the Reagan Democrat who defected from the party in the s. William Galston and Elaine Kamarck laid out the political case against liberals in a booklet, *The Politics of Evasion*, which became the guiding political manifesto of the DLC. In it, the authors, both of whom now work in the White House, declared that since the late s the Democratic Party had been beset by a rigid "liberal fundamentalism. Proof is that after , the Democrats had won only one out of the preceding six contests for the White House. The notion that the Democratic Party is a captive of left-wing extremists is a familiar one to readers of the American press. It has been a staple of conservative Republican doctrine since . In itself, this does not make the point incorrect, although it suggests that it is a bit musty. Reminiscent of the analysis that has been nurtured for decades in places such as the *National Review*, New Democrats have a tendency to argue at a level of abstract generalization that permits them to leap over some facts that would otherwise puncture their case. The first set of facts is historical. With the exception of McGovern in , in five of the last six presidential campaigns, the Democratic candidates--Humphrey, Carter, Mondale, and Dukakis--ran as centrists. Carter ran as a conservative southerner moderate on race. Indeed, the Carter presidency--the failure of which still weighs heavily on the Democratic psyche--was the exemplar of the New Democrat spirit. For this theory to be credible, the New Democrats have to argue that the convention was different. True to form, the press generally has obliged by favorably contrasting the convention with the "liberal" conventions of and . According to

accepted wisdom, these two previous conventions were dominated by demanding minorities, feminists, labor unions, environmentalists, gays, and people with bizarre "styles" of political behavior. But as media critic Jim Naureckas has pointed out, the press ran the same story of moderation during the previous conventions as well. For using words like "family, community, honesty, patriotism, accountability, responsibility, opportunity" Chicago Tribune. For abandoning "the expansive promises of Democratic Party platforms of earlier years --the crowded bazaar of special interests and special pleading" Washington Post. In the New York Times headlined: No laundry lists that raid our Treasury. Nor can one make the case that those on the left of the party have been somehow destructive or disloyal. They ran their candidates and tried to influence the platform. When they failed, they rallied behind the centrist candidate. Certainly the liberals have supported recent centrist candidates, starting with Jimmy Carter, with more loyalty than the conservatives showed to the candidacy of George McGovern. The campaign is a case in point. They were the activists who knocked on doors, raised money, and organized precincts. In contrast, many New Democrats seemed to spend their time complaining that Bill Clinton was allowing these people too much say in the campaign. Liberal loyalty to Clinton continued throughout the troubles of his first seven months in office. They stuck with his budget even after it had been gutted of the domestic spending that was at the heart of their agenda. In their New Democrat manifesto, Galston and Kamarck set up and effortlessly demolished a series of straw men, the supposed "myths" through which liberal fundamentalists have succeeded in getting the Democratic Party to evade reality. One is the argument that greater mobilization of minorities will automatically return a Democrat to the White House. They belabor what people who understand simple addition know: That is why they are known as minorities. One may object that Jackson is not the most effective person to make the appeal, but that is another question. Ironically, Galston and Kamarck divide the working class along racial lines in attacking this class mobilization thesis, and a few pages later they criticize the Left for believing that race is the main reason for the white, working-class departure from the party. Writing in , Galston and Kamarck tell us that the next Democratic candidate must be fully credible as commander in chief and "squarely reflect the moral sentiments of the average American. So next time around the Democrats need a candidate whose strengths lie in social and foreign policy. Had the unemployment rate in October been 5. He constantly attacked the "trickle-down" economics of the Republicans. And after outbidding George Bush with the promise of middle-class tax cuts flopped in the early primaries, Clinton overruled his DLC advisers and shifted to an emphasis on more government investment spending both as a way to jump-start the economy and to create more good jobs over the long run. He even argued that closing the public investment deficit was every bit as important as reducing the fiscal deficit. But as Naureckas pointed out, the press lets the party conservatives rewrite history every four years, whatever the outcome. The central failing of the Left is that it has not come to grips with the question of economic growth and stability in the new global economy. To some degree, the Left still views the world in the framework of the s, when a growing pie of income and wealth could be taken for granted and progressives could focus on how to slice it. Like the "liberal fundamentalists" they criticize, however, the New Democrats have practiced their own "politics of eva-sion" in avoiding the issue. The failure, he says, "has produced two decades of anemic gains in personal income. Jimmy Carter actually cut taxes in mid-term, a precursor to Reaganomics. Even Lyndon Johnson was not a "tax and spend" Democrat. In fact, history blames Johnson for not raising taxes to pay for the Vietnam War. Kennedy cut taxes, as did Truman before he raised them to pay for the Korean War. Faced with the question of how to reverse this two-decade slide of income and growth, he ducks: Macroeconomic policy aside, it is reflective of how "new" the philosophy of the New Democrat is. From is telling us what Michael Dukakis told us in , Walter Mondale in , and Jimmy Carter in and even George McGovern in that we must reduce the budget deficit. Indeed, if there is one plank in the economic platforms of both Democrats and Republicans that has not varied over the 20 years of anemic economic growth, it is the well-worn demand for deficit reduction. In any case, New Democrats seem to prefer turning the conversation to social programs. In the summer of , the DLC commissioned a poll of Perot voters which showed that three-quarters of them did not list the deficit as either the first or second most important problem facing the country. But the Perot voters did favor "radical change" in government more than did those who voted for Clinton or Bush. According to the Washington Post, when asked for an example of what radical

change in government would appeal to Perot voters, Al From and pollster Stanley Greenberg "were initially stumped. They then said welfare reform was the kind of change that would appeal to Perot voters. It is the traditional combination of a generalized denunciation of personal irresponsibility and support for specific programmatic changes liberals have advocated for years. New Democrats advocate ending welfare after two years. One can argue over the details, but this is the kind of program that liberal welfare policy analysts have been talking about for years. Dukakis made welfare reform a central piece of his platform. The problem--as From says and everyone knows--is delivering on the commitment. Indeed, when one actually reads the New Democrat social policy literature, it is hard to see what all the fuss is about. But when we get to programmatic details, the trumpet begins to squeak. New Democrats say they are for investment in education, for example, European-style worker training, and help to college students in return for community service. In terms of the specifics of social policy, New Democrats simply do not represent a radical departure from the things that the liberal wing of the party, its convention delegates, and its losing centrist candidates have been saying for years. It seems again that it is not liberalism they are quarreling with; it is the liberals. New Democrats claim government reform is a new centrist idea. Many of the specific proposals to free government agencies from the tyranny of annual budgets, to consolidate agencies, to promote public sector flexibility, and to inject more competition into the delivery of services are reasonable and indeed are part of the evolving American debate on public administration. By focusing some presidential attention on these issues, New Democrats have helped move the discussion forward. But when these issues are elevated to the level of a new public philosophy and used to attack liberals, the thinking becomes muddled and superficial, and the politics become conservative--encouraging the cheap shots against the public sector that have so poisoned popular political discussion in America. Thus New Democrats roll out the anecdotes about government inefficiency: There is much truth to these complaints, but to lay blame at the feet of liberal fundamentalists is absurd. It is not the liberals who entangle government agencies with restrictions and contradictory rules.

## 4: The New-Economy Movement | The Nation

*The original Progressives, and New Deal Democrats after them, fought for unprecedented tax and anti-monopoly policies to address unprecedented concentrations of wealth and economic power during their times, recognizing the urgency of those efforts to strengthen not only our economy but also our democracy.*

A Future that Works Economic disruption—the fading of old products, industries, and jobs in favor of new ones—has always been part of the American experience. Yet as everything else has changed, the laws, policies, and support structures that protect and promote American workers remain relics of a bygone era. New Democrats believe that as the nature of work continues to change, we can no longer rely on outdated systems and institutions to prepare and protect our workers. It is critical that we think and act now to ensure that all Americans have the opportunity to succeed in the changing economy. We need to close the skills and opportunity gap, rethink the relationship between employers and workers and empower workers and entrepreneurs.

**Education and Skills** The changing economy is creating new kinds of work and opportunities, requiring policymakers to improve the role and structure of learning for students and workers. The skills needed for students and workers to achieve the American Dream have changed. Skills also have a much shorter shelf-life than in the past. Learning and training is becoming a lifelong necessity to keep up with changing technology and demands. We must implement policies to help students and workers adapt, including modernizing and expanding access to career and technical education, traditional educational institutions, and skills training to help workers upskill or change occupations.

**Entrepreneurship** Startups and high growth businesses are the engines that drive our economy and the entrepreneurs who start them help spur growth that makes everyone more prosperous. More new businesses mean new ideas and more opportunities for consumers to purchase the goods and services they need. New Democrats support policies to make it easier for entrepreneurs to raise capital, get access to a high skilled workforce, and navigate the regulatory environment in order to grow our economy and create jobs. On our current trajectory, our budget deficits become more and more unsustainable further squeezing the important investments that will help create good-paying jobs, make the economy work better for everyone and keep our country safe. New Democrats support a bipartisan, long-term approach to address structural causes of our growing deficits and debt, including impact of the Republican tax bill and reforms to mandatory spending programs.

**Health Care** In order to increase access to affordable health care for all Americans, we must advance real solutions that reduce health care costs for families and seniors, increase choices for consumers, and encourage participation by the young and healthy. To stabilize health insurance markets and bring down the cost of healthcare for all Americans, New Democrats believe we must first stabilize the Affordable Care Act and strengthen it to provide more Americans with access to affordable health care options.

**Housing** The New Democrat Coalition believes access to affordable housing is paramount to the economic security of American families. Unfortunately, housing is increasingly unaffordable because prices and rents are rising faster than wages because construction is not keeping up with demand. The high cost of shelter is the single biggest squeeze on household budgets and a significant draft on the economy.

**Immigration** New Democrats believe both parties need to work together to pass comprehensive immigration reform. We can smartly secure our border and create a modern immigration system that reflects our American values, creates a process for undocumented immigrants with long ties to the U.

**Infrastructure** The New Democrat Coalition is determined to increase long-term federal investments in all types of infrastructure. This investment is vital to both the jobs created to build and maintain our infrastructure, as well as those supported and bolstered by a strong and healthy infrastructure system that facilitates the efficient movement of workers, goods, services, and ideas. Modernizing our infrastructure is important to Americans in every part of the country. We know that infrastructure projects are consistently evaluated as one of the best returns on government investments, and that Americans would rather spend more time doing the things they love than sitting in traffic wasting time and money. New Democrats believe that in order to maintain our competitive edge, the United States must promote the right environment for innovation.

**National Security** New Democrats are committed to a tough and smart national security strategy that secures our homeland and

protects our values. Our first responsibility as Members of Congress is to keep America safe. We need to invest in a 21st century military force and in national security agencies that adapt to modern challenges and eliminate terrorist threats without reckless interventions. We cannot ignore the indispensable role diplomacy and development play in meeting our most pressing security challenges and demonstrating American leadership in global affairs. We must advance a comprehensive national security policy that focuses on what really keeps Americans safe. Regulatory Reform Adopted and implemented correctly, regulatory oversight can boost competition and make markets more effective for everyday people. Unfortunately, some regulations can impose obstacles to new businesses, running the risk of stifling growth and limiting entrepreneurial opportunities. In many cases, regulatory oversight protects middle class Americans but still needs fine-tuning to operate more effectively. Tax Reform The New Democrat Coalition supports comprehensive tax reform that will promote economic growth, is targeted towards our middle class and is fiscally responsible. We believe tax reform done right is important for middle class families, American businesses and keeping our national economy competitive. Trade New Democrats support a pro-growth, pro-worker trade agenda that puts American jobs first. We need to set the rules for the global economy, not have them set by others. In doing so, the United States should focus on championing the economy of the future, not the economy of 50 years ago. Being actively engaged in global trade allows us to lead geo-politically; grows our economy and expands opportunity; exports our goods, services, and values; and levels the playing field for American workers, businesses, and farmers.

### 5: NDLF IT/ITES Employees Wing | IT/ITES Employees! Organize!

*New Democrats move easily from a call to arms against the liberal fundamentalists to the level of cliché, that is, the belabored insistence that New Democrats are different because they are for Opportunity, Family Values, Individual Responsibility, Better Government, and so on.*

Over the past few decades, however, a deepening sense of the profound ecological challenges facing the planet and growing despair at the inability of traditional politics to address economic failings have fueled an extraordinary amount of experimentation by activists, economists and socially minded business leaders. Most of the projects, ideas and research efforts have gained traction slowly and with little notice. But in the wake of the financial crisis, they have proliferated and earned a surprising amount of support—and not only among the usual suspects on the left. As the threat of a global climate crisis grows increasingly dire and the nation sinks deeper into an economic slump for which conventional wisdom offers no adequate remedies, more and more Americans are coming to realize that it is time to begin defining, demanding and organizing to build a new-economy movement. Ad Policy Gar Alperovitz is a participant in various systemic-change efforts, including some of the new-economy projects described in this article. This, in turn, leads to an emphasis on institutions whose priorities are broader than those that typically flow from the corporate emphasis on the bottom line. At the cutting edge of experimentation are the growing number of egalitarian, and often green, worker-owned cooperatives. In many communities urban agricultural efforts have made common cause with groups concerned about healthy nonprocessed food. And all this is to say nothing of 1. For-profits have developed alternatives as well. There are, for example, more than 11, companies owned entirely or in significant part by some Most have adopted Employee Stock Ownership Plans; these so-called ESOPs democratize ownership, though only some of them involve participatory management. Gore, maker of Gore-Tex and many other products, is a leading example: Litecontrol, which manufactures high-efficiency, high-performance architectural lighting fixtures, operates as a less typical ESOP; the Massachusetts-based company is entirely owned by roughly employees and fully unionized with the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. In certain states, companies that want to brandish their new-economy values can now also register as B Corporations. Without this legal authorization, a CEO could in theory be sued by stockholders if profit-making is not his sole objective. Such status ensures that specific goals are met by different companies manufacturers have different requirements from retail stores. It also helps with social marketing and branding. Cooperatives may not be a new idea—with at least million members more than one in three Americans , co-ops have broad political and cultural support—but they are becoming increasingly important in new-economy efforts. A widely discussed strategy in Cleveland suggests a possible next stage of development: A thoroughly green industrial-scale laundry, a solar installation company and a soon-to-be-opened large-scale commercial greenhouse capable of producing about 5 million heads of lettuce a year make up the first of a group of linked co-ops projected to expand in years to come. Senator Sherrod Brown is expected to introduce national legislation aimed at developing Evergreen-style models in other cities. Staff, managers and owners at many of these companies are finding more opportunities to share ideas and pool resources with like-minded professionals. The American Sustainable Business Council, a growing alliance of , business professionals and thirty business organizations, has emerged as a leading venue for such activity. In many ways the council operates like any advocacy group attempting to lobby, educate and promote legislation and strategies. Thirty-five leaders recently met with Labor Secretary Hilda Solis, for instance, to make clear that the US Chamber of Commerce does not speak for all American business, to seek her help with specific projects and issues, and to fill her in on a range of environmentally and socially concerned economic efforts that definitely do not do business as usual. By participating in the network, GreenLine Paper gains brand recognition and promotion, as well as marketing, policy support, technical assistance and access to a like-minded coalition of businesses. Sarah Stranahan, a longtime board member at the Needmor Fund, recalls having a sense in late that large numbers of Americans were beginning to understand that something is profoundly wrong with the economy. Bearing this in mind, with a small group of other activists she brought

leaders of diverse organizations together in early September of that year to explore ways to build a larger movement. The New Economy Network NEN , a loosely organized umbrella effort comprising roughly to new-economy leaders and organizations, was the low-budget product of their meeting. NEN acts primarily as a clearinghouse for information and research produced by member organizations. One shared effort is attempting to develop detailed indicators of sustainable economic activity. As many scholars have demonstrated, the gross national product indicator is profoundly misleading: Another is a detailed econometric model of how a very large economic system can move away from growth as its central objective. Related to both are earlier and ongoing Great Transition studies by the Tellus Institute, a think tank concerned with sustainability. Among other things, the working group which includes people, like Speth, who are concurrently involved in other initiatives is attempting to create detailed designs for state and local banks in support of new-economy institutional development. The longstanding Bank of North Dakota is one important precedent. The larger goal of the Working Group is to advance a coherent vision of an economy organized around sustainable local community economies. He envisions a trajectory of cultural change that could not only reduce conventionally defined economic growth but even reverse itâ€”in part to make up for past ecological and resource destruction, and also to deal with global warming. It is possible, even likely, that the explosion and ongoing development of institutional forms, along with new and more aggressive advocacy, will continue to gather substantial momentum as economic and ecological conditions worsen. Moreover, different new-economy advocates are clearly divided on matters of vision and strategy. Speth, for instance, sees far-reaching change as essential if the massive threat posed by climate change is ever to be dealt with; he views the various experiments as one vector of development that may help lay groundwork for more profound systemic change that challenges fundamental corporate priorities. Others, like David Levine, executive director of the American Sustainable Business Council, emphasize more immediate reforms and stress the need for a progressive business voice in near-term policy battles. What to do about the power of large private or public corporations in the long term is an unresolved question facing all parties. Apart from the central issue of how political power might be built over time, three in particular are clearly daunting: In theory an economic model that redistributes employment, consumption and investment in a zero- or reduced-growth system is feasible, but it is a very hard sell in times of unemployment, and it is a direct challenge to the central operating principle of the economic system. It is also a challenge to the priorities of most elements of the progressive coalition that has long based its economic hopes on Keynesian strategies aimed at increasing growth. A related problem concerns the labor movement. Many new-economy advocates hold progressive views on most issues of concern to labor. Still, the ultimate goal of reducing growth is incompatible with the interests of most labor leaders. Although there have been tentative off-the-record explorations of how to narrow differences among groups, no direction for agreement has emerged. IPS director Cavanagh is working with a small group of theorists and activists on a plan for green jobs that attempts to integrate new-economy concerns with those of labor and other progressive groups, and to link the expanding local efforts with traditional national strategies. A further line of possible long-term convergence is new interest by the United Steelworkers in alternative forms of economic enterpriseâ€”and, importantly, larger-scale efforts. The Steelworkers signed an agreement with the Mondragon Corporation in to collaborate in establishing unionized cooperatives based on the Mondragon model in manufacturing here and in Canada. Mondragon, based in the Basque region of Spain, has nearly , workers and is one of the largest and most successful cooperative enterprises in the world. A third and very different challenge is presented by traditional environmental organizations. Speth, a board member of the Natural Resources Defense Council, has found very little willingness among his fellow board members to discuss system-changing strategies, even if understood as long-term developmental efforts. The traditional organizations spend most of their time trying to put out fires in Washington, he notes, and have little capacity to stand back and consider deeper strategic issuesâ€”particularly if they involve movement building and challenges to the current orthodoxy. The first is obvious: Nor were the eruptions of many other powerful movementsâ€”from late-nineteenth-century populism to civil rights to feminism and gay rightsâ€”predicted by those who viewed politics only through the narrow prism of the current moment. No one in the months and years leading up to Earth Day predicted the

extraordinary wave of environmental activism that would follow—especially since environmental demands are largely focused on morally informed, society-wide concerns, unlike those of the labor, civil rights and feminist movements, all of which involve specific gains important to specific people. In my judgment, new-economy efforts will ultimately pose much more radical systemic challenges than many have contemplated. Nonetheless, new-economy advocates are beginning to tap into sources of moral concern similar to those of the early environmental movement. As the economy continues to falter, the possibility that these advocates—along with many other Americans who share their broader concerns—will help define a viable path toward long-term systemic change is not to be easily dismissed. To submit a correction for our consideration, [click here](#). For Reprints and Permissions, [click here](#).

## 6: Issues | New Democrat Coalition

*New Democrats Hail the New Economy Americans for Democratic Action Reports from HIST R at University of Maryland.*

Tommy Douglas , Leader: During this process, a large number of New Party Clubs were established to allow like-minded Canadians to join in its founding, and six representatives from New Party Clubs were added to the National Committee. In , at the end of a five-day long Founding Convention which established its principles, policies and structures, the New Democratic Party was born and Tommy Douglas , the long-time CCF Premier of Saskatchewan , was elected its first leader. Trudeau minority[ edit ] At the leadership convention , an activist group called The Waffle tried to take control of the party, but were defeated by David Lewis with the help of trade union members. The NDP itself supported the minority government formed by the Pierre Trudeau -led Liberals from to , although the two parties never entered into a coalition. Together they succeeded in passing several socially progressive initiatives into law such as pension indexing and the creation of the crown corporation Petro-Canada. Lewis lost his own riding and resigned as leader the following year. Ed Broadbent[ edit ] Under the leadership of Ed Broadbent - , the NDP attempted to find a more populist image to contrast with the governing parties, focusing on more pocketbook issues than on ideological fervor. Party logo during the s The result in created two unexpected results for the party: The first was an offer by Trudeau to form a coalition government to allow for greater Western representation in Cabinet and a "united front" regarding the upcoming Quebec referendum. Broadbent, aware that the NDP would have no ability to hold the balance of power and thus no leverage in the government, declined out of fear the party would be subsumed. Broadbent would act as a moderating influence on Trudeau during the debates, and the eventual compromise that brought about the Constitution Act, was partially authored by Saskatchewan NDP Attorney General and future premier Roy Romanow. In the election , which saw the Progressive Conservatives win the most seats in Canadian history, the NDP won 30 seats, while the governing Liberals fell to 40 seats. The Liberals, however, had reaped most of the benefits of opposing free trade to emerge as the dominant alternative to the ruling government. In , Broadbent stepped down after 14 years as federal leader of the NDP. During the campaign, Barrett argued that the party should be concerned with western alienation , rather than focusing its attention on Quebec. Although enjoying strong support among organized labour and rural voters in the Prairies, McLaughlin tried to expand their support into Quebec without much success. Under McLaughlin, the party did manage to win an election in Quebec for the first time when Edmonston won a by-election. Edmonston, a Quebec nationalist , frequently clashed with his own party over this position on Canadian federalism , and did not run for re-election. McLaughlin and the NDP were routed in the election , where the party won only nine seats, three seats short of official party status in the House of Commons. The loss was blamed on the unpopularity of NDP provincial governments under Bob Rae in Ontario and Mike Harcourt in British Columbia and the loss of a significant portion of Western vote to the Reform Party, which promised a more decentralized and democratic federation along with right-wing economic reforms. In contrast to traditional but diminishing Canadian practice, where an MP for a safe seat stands down to allow a newly elected leader a chance to enter Parliament via a by-election , McDonough opted to wait until the next election to enter Parliament. The party recovered somewhat in the election , electing 21 members. The NDP made a breakthrough in Atlantic Canada , a region where they had been practically nonexistent at the federal level. Before , they had won only three seats in the Atlantic in their entire history. However, in they won eight seats in that region, in the process unseating Liberal ministers David Dingwall and Doug Young. The party was able to harness the discontent of voters in the Atlantic, who were upset over cuts to employment insurance and other social programs. Afterwards, McDonough was widely perceived as trying to move the party toward the centre of the political spectrum, in the Third Way mould of British Prime Minister Tony Blair. Union leaders were lukewarm in their support, often threatening to break away from the NDP, while Canadian Auto Workers head Buzz Hargrove called for her resignation. In the November election , the NDP campaigned primarily on the issue of Medicare but lost significant support. The governing Liberals ran an effective campaign on their

economic record and managed to recapture some of the Atlantic ridings lost to the NDP in the election. The initial high electoral prospects of the Canadian Alliance under new leader Stockwell Day also hurt the NDP as many supporters strategically voted Liberal to keep the Alliance from winning. The party embarked on a renewal process starting in A general convention in Winnipeg in November made significant alterations to party structures, and reaffirmed its commitment to the left. Like McDonough before him, Layton did not contest a seat in Parliament until the election. In the interim, he appointed Blaikie as deputy leader and made him parliamentary leader of the NDP. The party was disappointed to see its two Saskatchewan incumbents defeated in close races [17] by the new Conservative Party created by merger of the Alliance and PC parties , perhaps because of the unpopularity of the NDP provincial government. The Liberals had recruited several prominent NDP members, most notably former British Columbia Premier Ujjal Dosanjh , to run as Liberals as part of a drive to convince NDP voters that a reunited Conservative Party could sneak up the middle in the event of a split in the centre-left vote. The NDP campaign also experienced controversy after Layton suggested the removal of the Clarity Act , considered by some to be vital to keeping Quebec in Canada and by others as undemocratic, and promised to recognize any declaration of independence by Quebec after a referendum. Layton would later reverse his position and support the Act in Combined, the Liberals and NDP had seats "one short of the total needed for the balance of power. The governing Liberals agreed to support the changes in exchange for NDP support on confidence votes. In late June, the amendments passed final reading and many political pundits concluded that the NDP had gained credibility and clout on the national scene. When the Liberals refused, Layton announced that he would introduce a motion on November 24 that would ask Martin to call a federal election in February to allow for several pieces of legislation to be passed. The Liberals turned down this offer. Columnist Andrew Coyne has suggested that the NDP was unlikely to receive much credit for continuing to further prop up the Liberals, so they ended their support for the Martin government. During the election , the NDP focused their attacks on the Liberal party, in order to counter Liberal appeals for strategic voting. After the campaign, the Ontario NDP expelled CAW leader Buzz Hargrove from the party which has a common membership both federally and provincially, see below for his support of the Liberals. On January 23, the NDP won 29 seats, a significant increase of 10 seats from the 19 won in It was the fourth-best performance in party history, approaching the level of popular support enjoyed in the s. Ed Broadbent and Jack Layton at a election rally in Toronto The Conservatives won a minority government in the election, and initially the NDP was the only party that would not be able to pass legislation with the Conservatives. However, following a series of floor crossings , the NDP also came to hold the balance of power. The NDP voted against the government in all four confidence votes in the 39th parliament, the only party to do so. These were votes on the United States-Canada softwood lumber dispute , extending the mission to Afghanistan , the Canadian federal budget and federal budget. However, it worked with the Conservatives on other issues. This marked the second time ever and first time in seventeen years that the NDP won a riding in Quebec. The party won 37 seats in the federal election , the best performance since the federal election total of The party had a historic breakthrough in Quebec , where they won 59 out of 75 seats. In July , Layton announced that he was suffering from a new cancer and would take a leave of absence, projected to last until the resumption of Parliament in September. The party confirmed his suggestion of Hull's Aylmer MP Nycole Turmel to carry out the functions of party leader in his absence. Layton died from his cancer on August 22, In his final letter, Layton called for a leadership election to be held in early to choose his successor, [24] which was held on March 24, , and elected new leader Thomas Mulcair. The party was locked out of the Atlantic Region and the Territories, and lost over half of its seats in Ontario including all of its seats in Toronto. Consequently, his successor was to be chosen at a leadership election to be held no later than October but Mulcair chose to remain as interim leader until then. The CCF grew from populist , agrarian and socialist roots into a modern social democratic party. It has broadened to include concerns of the New Left , and advocates issues such as LGBT rights , international peace , and environmental stewardship. Please try to keep recent events in historical perspective and add more content related to non-recent events. May Learn how and when to remove this template message New Democrats today advocate, among other things:

### 7: Our Agenda | New Democrat Coalition

*Democrats have a point lead in congressional preference among registered voters, according to a new national poll. Nearly 6 in 10 voters said they would like to see a significant change in the direction President Donald Trump is taking the country, the NBC News/Wall Street Journal poll states.*

### 8: New Democrats - Wikipedia

*Silver Lining of Democratic Takeover of the House Republicans are understandably disappointed in the loss of the House of Representatives “but there are some good things about it for.*

### 9: About | New Democracy

*New Democrats, also called centrist Democrats, Clinton Democrats or moderate Democrats, are a centrist ideological faction within the Democratic Party that emerged after the victory of Republican George H. W. Bush at the presidential election.*

*Miss Bindergarten Stays Home From Kindergarten (Miss Bindergarten Books) Pentaho data integration kettle tutorial Transitional constraints The taming of tuberculosis and leprosy Wild flowers as they grow The Best of Django Reinhardt Start Over, Finish Rich Cancun, Cozumel, Yucatan Peninsula 97 Make Anger Your Ally (Living Books) Collection to ICC Arbitral Awards 1991-1995/Recuel des Sentences Arbitrales de La (Publications on Ocean Considering benefits to offer The harvest home hors doeuvres book Successful Problem-Solving and Test-Taking for Nursing and Nclex-Pn Exams Yahya Birt Aftab Ahmad Malik Hamza Yusuf Hanson Suheil Laher David Dakake Ruin of representation in modernist art and texts Trigonometry tutorial step by step Inquiry into the allocation of water resources Cultural implications of an indigenous church William A. Smalley Loves labours wonne Torch of Certainty Letters of a Victorian Army Officer John Steuart Currys Hoover and the Flood 23 Chapter 11: A Rift in Ivan 4:18 Feeling fat, fuzzy, or frazzled? Merge a edition adobe List of interviewees Steve cook 21 day shred Siuccessful project management 6th edition Dean Forest stories. Personal Prayers for Teens Fibonacci and Lucas Numbers with Applications Religion and faction in Humes moral philosophy Delmore, 1913-1966 Encyclopedia of Victorian colored pattern glass Prohibitions of religion in antiquity : setting the course of Europes religious history Dorothea Baudy Life of Roscommon. The academic administration Guyton and hall question book Hating perfection What a wonderful world piano sheet music*