

July 14, 2013

**Jennifer Rubin** calls it amateur hour.

*Now and then we get a perfect microcosm of the president's ineptness. On foreign policy it's Egypt and on domestic policy it's the student loan debacle.*

*On Egypt, Foreign Policy reports: "Washington's exhaustive attempts to be viewed as a neutral player in Egypt's coup are unraveling as pro and anti-Muslim Brotherhood forces latch onto any evidence that America is against them." Well, they both are right, I suppose. A policy in which neither side believes the U.S. is being constructive and in which it is impossible to tell what our policy is pretty much defines failure.*

*The domestic counterpart is the student loan mess. House Republicans agreed with the president's compromise plan on the expiration of the student loan discount. But Senate Dems are at each other's throats, a clear sign the president didn't get support for his compromise before releasing it. The Hill reports:*

*'Liberal firebrand Sen. Elizabeth Warren (Mass.) blasted a fellow Democratic senator Tuesday as a dispute over student loan rates escalated divisions within the party.*

*The clash, which is highly unusual among party colleagues in the upper chamber, came at a private caucus meeting about a subject that is helping Republicans land blows against their Democratic opponents.*

*"Elizabeth came out very strong against Manchin," said a Democratic senator who requested anonymity to discuss the exchange. "She said, 'They're already making money off the backs of students, and this adds another \$1 billion.' "*

*The rival messages appeared to exasperate Sen. Charles Schumer (N.Y.), the Senate's Democratic messaging chief, who engaged in an animated conversation with Sens. Joe Manchin, Tom Carper and Angus King before they met with reporters. House Speaker John Boehner (Ohio) had a nice soft ball over the plate which he casually hit over the fence in a written statement: ...*

**Paul Brandus at The Week** calls him "flounderer in chief."

*Six months into his new term, President Obama should be feeling pretty good. After all, the economy is looking up and Americans are more confident about their prospects. The job market is healing and housing prices are up double-digits over the past year. New cars are rolling out of showrooms at the fastest pace in nearly six years. There's nothing like that new car smell.*

*Yet to many folks in Washington and around the country, a different odor is discernible: It's one of panic, they say, the smell of a president who is floundering. He seems to know it himself.*

*"I sure do wanna do some governing," Obama said at a recent fundraiser. "I wanna get some stuff done. I've only got three and a half years left, and it goes by (snaps his fingers) like that."*

*Most Americans wanna see some governing too. We wanna see some stuff get done. But we haven't, at least not yet. For a man who claims to have an acute awareness of time, the president has an inexplicable knack for wasting it.*

*Tick tock: He spent the first four months of his new term fighting for gun control, an emotionally driven response to an issue of undeniable importance. But (and with the utmost respect to the victims of gun violence) it is not an issue on par with the number one concern for the vast majority of Americans: jobs and the economy. The White House has also been in reactive mode to the IRS mess, and the revelation that the government is tracking our phone calls, email, and snail mail. On top of that came a quiet news dump, deliberately timed to occur as the 4th of July weekend was getting underway, that the employer provision in ObamaCare, the president's crowning domestic achievement thus far, was being delayed until after the 2014 midterms. ...*

**Peter Foster** at Telegraph, UK says foreign policy ratings are plummeting.

*A fascinating new poll is out today that shows Barack Obama's foreign policy approval rating has plummeted over the last two months.*

*On May 1 the Quinnipiac poll found that 47 per cent of Americans approved of Mr Obama's handling of foreign policy, while 43 per cent disapproved. Two months later the same pollster has Mr Obama running a 12-point negative rating – 52 per cent disapprove, compared with 40 that approve.*

*That's a sharp fall, given the fact that it comes after one of the busiest periods in Mr Obama's presidency for foreign policy. There was the shirt-sleeve summit with China's new president, the decision to do more in Syria, the announcement of talks with the Taliban and now, of course the coup-that-wasn't in Egypt. ...*

All of this leads **Megan McArdle** to think the GOP will be in control in 2017.

*My assertion that there's a 70% chance that the GOP controls White House, Senate, and House in 2017 has attracted a lot of pushback. And it's certainly possible that I'm wrong! Here's my thinking, for what it's worth:*

*Since the Civil War, only two Democratic presidents have been succeeded by another Democrat. Both of them—FDR and JFK—accomplished this by dying in office.*

*Since World War II, only four presidents have been succeeded by a member of their party. As I mentioned above, two of them accomplished this by dying in office. One of them accomplished this by resigning in disgrace ahead of his own impeachment. Only one of them, Ronald Reagan, left office at the end of his appointed term and was succeeded by a duly elected member of his own party. Mostly, the White House flips back and forth like a metronome.*

*At the beginning of Obama's term, people were talking about the kind of Democratic dominance that FDR enjoyed. Didn't happen. Isn't going to. So I think the GOP goes into the race with a big edge on the White House. Voters just get tired after eight years.*

*For example, when I pointed out how few presidents have been succeeded by members of their own party, you may have been tempted to argue that Al Gore “really” won. I’m not going to have that argument right now, but even assuming you’re correct, what does that tell you? That after the greatest economic boom in decades, the Democratic vice president fought hard to a statistical tie with the Republican governor of Texas. Sure, he wasn’t the most charismatic candidate either, but neither was George Bush. Getting a third term in the White House just seems to be really difficult. And Barack Obama is not going to finish with a ground-shaking economic boom.*

*Add to that the Democratic bench. ...*

A quaint thought leads off the latest column by **Thomas Sowell**.

*I am so old that I can remember when most of the people promoting race hate were white.*

*Apparently other Americans also recognize that the sources of racism are different today from what they were in the past. According to a recent Rasmussen poll, 31 percent of blacks think that most blacks are racists, while 24 percent of blacks think that most whites are racist.*

*The difference between these percentages is not great, but it is remarkable nevertheless. After all, generations of blacks fought the white racism from which they suffered for so long. If many blacks themselves now think that most other blacks are racist, that is startling.*

*The moral claims advanced by generations of black leaders — claims that eventually touched the conscience of the nation and turned the tide toward civil rights for all — have now been cheapened by today’s generation of black “leaders,” who act as if it is all just a matter of whose ox is gored. ...*

**Walter Williams'** takeaway from the Zimmerman trial was the sad state of black education.

*As if more evidence were needed about the tragedy of black education, Rachel Jeantel, a witness for the prosecution in the George Zimmerman murder trial, put a face on it for the nation to see. Some of that evidence unfolded when Zimmerman's defense attorney asked 19-year-old Jeantel to read a letter that she allegedly had written to Trayvon Martin's mother. She responded that she doesn't read cursive, and that's in addition to her poor grammar, syntax and communication skills.*

*Jeantel is a senior at Miami Norland Senior High School. How in the world did she manage to become a 12th-grader without being able to read cursive writing? That's a skill one would expect from a fourth-grader. Jeantel is by no means an exception at her school. Here are a few achievement scores from her school: Thirty-nine percent of the students score basic for reading, and 38 percent score below basic. In math, 37 percent score basic, and 50 percent score below basic. Below basic is the score when a student is unable to demonstrate even partial mastery of knowledge and skills fundamental for proficient work at his grade level. Basic indicates only partial mastery.*

*Few Americans, particularly black Americans, have any idea of the true magnitude of the black education tragedy. The education establishment might claim that it's not their fault. They're not responsible for the devastation caused by female-headed families, drugs, violence and the culture of dependency. But they are totally responsible for committing gross educational fraud. It's educators who graduated Jeantel from elementary and middle school and continued to pass her along in high school. It's educators who will, in June 2014, confer upon her a high-school diploma. ...*

**Paul Mirengoff** thinks there is nobody as clueless as John Kerry.

*Has the United States ever had a more clueless Secretary of State than John Kerry? Perhaps, but I can't think of one.*

*Not long ago, James Rosen traveled with Kerry to Egypt, among other places. Kerry met for two and half hours with then-President Mohammed Morsi. According to Rosen's report in Playboy (yes, Playboy):*

*Kerry emerged from [the meeting] so persuaded of Morsi's sincerity in pledging to administer the IMF reforms and extend an olive branch to his political opponents that Kerry decided on the spot to unlock \$250 million in frozen U.S. aid.*

*Within 72 hours [Kerry's aides] informed us that the Egyptian Supreme Court had just canceled the parliamentary elections set for April and that the intentions of Morsi and the Brotherhood were again proving difficult to discern.  
(Emphasis added)*

*There are areas in which Kerry's ability to discern is unquestioned — French wine, yachts, and the like. But if one cannot discern the intentions of the Muslim Brotherhood, or worse, discerns them as extending the olive branch to political opponents — one shouldn't dabble in, much less help shape, foreign policy.*

*Kerry is an old hand at romanticizing anti-American tyrants and would-be tyrants. Most recently, he perceived Bashar al-Assad as a potential U.S. ally and Middle East peace-broker, prepared to extend the olive branch to Israel.*

*Kerry isn't totally devoid of the ability to judge character, though. He figured out that John Edwards was a phony. Then, he made Edwards his choice for Vice President of the United States.*

---

---

---

## Right Turn

### Amateur hour at the White House

by Jennifer Rubin

Now and then we get a perfect microcosm of the president's ineptness. On foreign policy it's Egypt and on domestic policy it's the student loan debacle.

On Egypt, [Foreign Policy reports](#): "Washington's exhaustive attempts to be viewed as a neutral player in Egypt's coup are unraveling as pro and anti-Muslim Brotherhood forces latch onto any evidence that America is against them." Well, they both are right, I suppose. A policy in which neither side believes the U.S. is being constructive and in which it is impossible to tell what our policy is pretty much defines failure.

The domestic counterpart is the student loan mess. House Republicans agreed with the president's compromise plan on the expiration of the student loan discount. But Senate Dems are at each other's throats, a clear sign the president didn't get support for his compromise before releasing it. [The Hill reports](#):

Liberal firebrand Sen. Elizabeth Warren (Mass.) blasted a fellow Democratic senator Tuesday as a dispute over student loan rates escalated divisions within the party.

The clash, which is highly unusual among party colleagues in the upper chamber, came at a private caucus meeting about a subject that is helping Republicans land blows against their Democratic opponents.

"Elizabeth came out very strong against Manchin," said a Democratic senator who requested anonymity to discuss the exchange. "She said, 'They're already making money off the backs of students, and this adds another \$1 billion.' "

The rival messages appeared to exasperate Sen. Charles Schumer (N.Y.), the Senate's Democratic messaging chief, who engaged in an animated conversation with Sens. Joe Manchin, Tom Carper and Angus King before they met with reporters. House Speaker John Boehner (Ohio) had a nice soft ball over the plate which he casually hit over the fence in a written statement:

*Republicans acted to protect students from higher interest rates and make college more affordable, yet Senate Democratic leaders let student loan interest rates double without passing any legislation to address the issue. While the House-passed bill mirrors what the president has proposed, Senate Democratic leaders seem content to leave students and their families with higher borrowing costs and more student debt, which is shameful and unacceptable.*

In each case you could make an argument for either side (lock in lower student loan rates or let them go up; back the Egyptian military or cut them off for staging a coup), but the White House doesn't explain itself, implement its policies (if it has any) or work with Congress. The result is disarray and inaction.

Liberal pundits can blame GOP intransigence for all ills inside the Beltway, but in fact nothing so fouls up the domestic agenda and our foreign policy as an inattentive and inept White House.

Is there any surprise opponents of Obamacare smell blood in the water? It is more than simply the individual mandate and the lawlessness and unintended consequences that flow from delaying it. There is a well-grounded fear that the [White House](#) really isn't capable of doing the simple things, let alone something as unwieldy and ill-conceived as Obamacare.

## The Week

### President Obama: Flounderer-in-chief?

*This is not a president who is in command of events. Events are in command of him.*

by Paul Brandus

Six months into his new term, President Obama should be feeling pretty good. After all, the economy is looking up and Americans are more confident about their prospects. The job market is healing and housing prices are up double-digits over the past year. New cars are rolling out of showrooms at the fastest pace in nearly six years. There's nothing like that new car smell.

Yet to many folks in Washington and around the country, a different odor is discernible: It's one of panic, they say, the smell of a president who is floundering. He seems to know it himself.

"I sure do wanna do some governing," Obama said at a recent fundraiser. "I wanna get some stuff done. I've only got three and a half years left, and it goes by (snaps his fingers) like that."

Most Americans wanna see some governing too. We wanna see some stuff get done. But we haven't, at least not yet. For a man who claims to have an acute awareness of time, the president has an inexplicable knack for wasting it.

Tick tock: He spent the first four months of his new term fighting for gun control, an emotionally driven response to an issue of undeniable importance. But (and with the utmost respect to the victims of gun violence) it is not an issue on par with the number one concern for the vast majority of Americans: jobs and the economy. The White House has also been in reactive mode to the IRS mess, and the revelation that the government is tracking our phone calls, email, and snail mail. On top of that came a quiet news dump, deliberately timed to occur as the 4th of July weekend was getting underway, that the employer provision in ObamaCare, the president's crowning domestic achievement thus far, was being delayed until after the 2014 midterms.

Then there is the cascading series of problems overseas. In March, it was North Korea and its threats to attack us. In June, unrest swept our close NATO ally, Turkey. Now, it's Egypt's turn for turmoil. And throughout, of course, there has been Syria. The president warned there would be repercussions if the Assad regime crossed the "red line" and used chemical weapons on its own people. A month ago the White House said the line had been crossed. But a month has passed and anti-Assad rebels complain they haven't gotten the weapons they were promised. Tick tock.

This is not a president who is in command of events. Events are in command of him.

The polls reflect growing disappointment with the president. Thursday's [Real Clear Politics average](#) of all recent polls puts Obama's approval at 44.6 percent, his lowest standing in a year and a half.

To put this in [context](#), Obama is well below most other two-term presidents at this point in their second term. In July 1957, Dwight Eisenhower enjoyed an approval rating of 65 percent. In July 1985, Ronald Reagan stood at 63 percent. Six months into his second term, Bill Clinton had a 58 percent approval, and even George W. Bush, in July 2005 (just before Hurricane Katrina and the economic collapse dragged him down), was at 49 percent. The only two-term predecessor Obama tops is Richard Nixon, who in July 1973 was at 39 percent and falling in his Watergate death spiral.

Of course, Obama is quick to blame Republicans, particularly in the House, for many of his problems, and that's a fair point. As low as Obama has sunk in the polls, Congress' job approval — at 13.6 percent according to the Real Clear Politics average — remains mired at friends and family levels, and lawmakers in general are universally despised and disrespected. By this standard, Obama doesn't look so bad.

But Obama will ultimately be measured by his accomplishments, not how he stacks up against his enemies. Presidents are the ones who set the tone and set the agenda for the nation. This, when done right, is leadership. Americans always look to their president to provide it. Obama's fed up with Republican obstructionism? Fine: Go on TV and call them out. Challenge John Boehner and Mitch McConnell to debate immigration, climate change, and spending in a townhall-style setting. If they refuse, use it against them. Obama, aloof and insular — and convinced he's smarter than everyone else — would never get his hands dirty like this. But a change in tactics, in demeanor — something — is needed because whatever it is he's doing now doesn't seem to be working.

## Telegraph, UK

### [Obama's foreign policy ratings plummet: Americans want a winner, not a weakling](#)

by Peter Foster

A fascinating [new poll](#) is out today that shows Barack Obama's foreign policy approval rating has plummeted over the last two months.

On May 1 the Quinnipiac poll found that 47 per cent of Americans approved of Mr Obama's handling of foreign policy, while 43 per cent disapproved. Two months later the same pollster has Mr Obama running a 12-point negative rating – 52 per cent disapprove, compared with 40 that approve.

That's a sharp fall, given the fact that it comes after one of the busiest periods in Mr Obama's presidency for foreign policy. There was the shirt-sleeve summit with China's new president, the decision to do more in Syria, the announcement of talks with the Taliban and now, of course the coup-that-wasn't in Egypt.

The numbers are telling because they point to a central contradiction of the Obama presidency – how is it that man who expresses such a clear vision at home can look so muddled abroad?

The same polls shows that Obama is seen as "trustworthy" (50-44) by a majority of Americans, caring for the common man (52-45), and a strong leader (52-46) who also get's the thumbs-up for his handling of "terrorism" (52-43).

And yet those qualities don't translate into his foreign policy ratings, and the reason is that in that arena, Mr Obama has displayed none of those characteristics lately.

The frustration in Washington is not so much what Mr Obama has done in Egypt, or even for many in Syria, but the manner of his doing it.

The polls might show that Americans don't care about foreign policy – that they want out of Afghanistan and don't want to be too entangled in Syria, but as [Bill Clinton rightly pointed out recently](#), that doesn't mean they don't want to see leadership.

This doesn't mean boots on the ground or needless wars – though the polls also shows 49-38 per cent support for cruise missile or drone attacks on Syrian government targets - but it does mean providing direction, setting a moral compass for others to follow.

It doesn't mean Mr Obama should be expected, or is able, to solve all these thorny problems, but he does need to pin his colours to the mast.

Mr Obama does this on domestic policy all the time, even though he knows actually achieving his goals on immigration or healthcare reform are incredibly difficult.

His favourite phrase is the "right thing to do", but on foreign policy there is only the "expedient thing to do", or more often a sense of "nothing to be done at all".

It's not that there's a serious majority of people who want to cut off US aid to Egypt, but Mr Obama hasn't even felt the moral obligation to condemn – in person and publicly – the killings in Cairo and urge the restoration of a real political process, as he has behind the scenes.

You could say this was just cosmetics, but the public face of the "Leader of the Free World", as we still see the US president, does matter.

This is not about having naive expectations, but matching the expectations of the American public, who for all their war-weariness still feel in their bones (like it or not) that America is there to make the world a better place.

Mr Obama is visibly weighed down by the limitations of what the US can do in Egypt or Syria, but then makes the mistake of project the burdens of his office to the American public and wider world when – as [Clinton intuitively knows](#) - they expect their president to be a winner, not a weakling.

I suspect these numbers reflect much of that.



**Megan McArdle**

## **Why I Think the GOP Will Have Control in 2017**

My assertion that there's a 70% chance that the GOP controls White House, Senate, and House in 2017 has attracted a lot of pushback. And it's certainly possible that I'm wrong! Here's my thinking, for what it's worth:

Since the Civil War, only two Democratic presidents have been succeeded by another Democrat. Both of them—FDR and JFK—accomplished this by dying in office.

Since World War II, only four presidents have been succeeded by a member of their party. As I mentioned above, two of them accomplished this by dying in office. One of them accomplished this by resigning in disgrace ahead of his own impeachment. Only one of them, Ronald Reagan, left office at the end of his appointed term and was succeeded by a duly elected member of his own party. Mostly, the White House flips back and forth like a metronome.

At the beginning of Obama's term, people were talking about the kind of Democratic dominance that FDR enjoyed. Didn't happen. Isn't going to. So I think the GOP goes into the race with a big edge on the White House. Voters just get tired after eight years.

For example, when I pointed out how few presidents have been succeeded by members of their own party, you may have been tempted to argue that Al Gore "really" won. I'm not going to have that argument right now, but even assuming you're correct, what does that tell you? That after the greatest economic boom in decades, the Democratic vice president fought hard to a statistical tie with the Republican governor of Texas. Sure, he wasn't the most charismatic candidate either, but neither was George Bush. Getting a third term in the White House just seems to be really difficult. And Barack Obama is not going to finish with a ground-shaking economic boom.

Add to that the Democratic bench. Hillary Clinton is a formidable politician, but she will be nearly 70 years old in 2016. No one else except Biden (who is older than she) has anything like the national name recognition that multiple people on the GOP bench enjoy. But if one or both of those two decide to run (and I think it's nearly certain that they will), they'll probably get the nomination just because they will suck all the oxygen away from the other candidates—both the money and the publicity will follow them. And though they're both formidable challengers, I think their age is going to hurt them. I think it would have hurt Reagan if he'd been running against more formidable opponents, but Carter was badly damaged, and Walter Mondale was a nice man who made a very good Senate candidate in Minnesota.

Democrats who think they're a shoo-in seem to be unaccountably banking on the GOP nominating some tongue-tied wingnut who will spend the campaign discussing the scientific evidence that women can't get pregnant from rape. But as Joe Scarborough argued in 2012, this is wishful thinking . . . in his words, "The GOP doesn't nominate crazy". In 2012, out of an incredibly weak field filled with tongue-tied wingnuts, they nominated the moderate with the best public policy chops and solid debating skills. In 2016, they will have a much more attractive bevy of candidates from which to choose someone electable.

So I think that the chances that the GOP takes the White House are probably pretty high—maybe around 75%. This is not a Nate-Silver-style I-ran-9,000-regressions-and-here's-what-I-got. It's just my gut estimate of the odds. When Nate starts running his projections, I will revise accordingly.

Now, if the GOP takes the White House, I think the chances that they also take the House approach 100%. They have a big structural advantage here, and the president will pull a bunch of Republicans in on his coattails. As far as I can tell, everyone agrees with this, so I won't belabor it.

The Senate is the biggest wildcard. 2016 is going to be a bit of a challenge for the GOP, since they'll be defending the wave class of 2010. But some of those folks generally cited as liabilities, like Pat Toomey, [actually seem to be doing okay](#). (In large part because they've tacked left on key issues, which should be a lesson to the Tea Party about the limits of primary challenges. But that's a blog post for another day.) They'll be helped by the fact that the president will have coattails in the Senate as well.

Moreover, the 2014 election, as I understand it, actually looks pretty good for the GOP—Democrats are defending a lot more vulnerable seats than Republicans, and the president's party tends to suffer during midterms. If the GOP can get to 48 or 49 seats, I think it's quite likely that they'll get to 50 in 2016.

Note that I don't think they'll establish permanent control; I think the odds are for a fragile majority of 50 or 51 seats, which they're vulnerable to losing if anyone dies or resigns. If they do get control, I expect they'll lose it in 2018 midterms . . . which is why I suspect they might not “go nuclear”.

Anyway, that's my reasoning. Entirely provisional, and I'm open to corrections. But that's why I wouldn't get rid of the filibuster if I were Harry Reid. Even if you think the chances that you lose the Senate and the White House are 50% it's not a good gamble. For that matter, even if you keep the Senate and lose the White House, it's not a good bet. Eventually you'll lose the Senate, because control of that august institution seems to be pretty unstable. And in the meantime, since you don't have the White House, you can't actually do much with your new, filibuster-less power.

## **Jewish World Review**

### **Who Is Racist?**

by Thomas Sowell

I am so old that I can remember when most of the people promoting race hate were white.

Apparently other Americans also recognize that the sources of racism are different today from what they were in the past. According to a recent Rasmussen poll, 31 percent of blacks think that most blacks are racists, while 24 percent of blacks think that most whites are racist.

The difference between these percentages is not great, but it is remarkable nevertheless. After all, generations of blacks fought the white racism from which they suffered for so long. If many blacks themselves now think that most other blacks are racist, that is startling.

The moral claims advanced by generations of black leaders — claims that eventually touched the conscience of the nation and turned the tide toward civil rights for all — have now been cheapened by today's generation of black "leaders," who act as if it is all just a matter of whose ox is gored.

Even in legal cases involving terrible crimes — the O.J. Simpson murder trial or the charges of gang rape against Duke University students — many black "leaders" and their followers have not waited for facts about who was guilty and who was not, but have immediately taken sides, based on who was black and who was white.

Among whites, according to the same Rasmussen poll, 38 percent consider most blacks racist and 10 percent consider most whites racist.

Broken down by politics, the same poll showed that 49 percent of Republicans consider most blacks racist, as do 36 percent of independents and 29 percent of Democrats.

Perhaps most disturbing of all, just 29 percent of Americans as a whole think race relations are getting better, while 32 percent think race relations are getting worse. The difference is too close to call, but the fact that it is so close is itself painful — and perhaps a warning sign for where we are heading.

Is this what so many Americans, both black and white, struggled for, over the decades and generations, to try to put the curse of racism behind us — only to reach a point where retrogression in race relations now seems at least equally likely as progress?

What went wrong? Perhaps no single factor can be blamed for all the things that went wrong. Insurgent movements of all sorts, in countries around the world, have for centuries soured in the aftermath of their own success. "The revolution betrayed" is a theme that goes back at least as far as 18th century France.

The civil rights movement in 20th century America attracted many people who put everything on the line for the sake of fighting against racial oppression. But the eventual success of that movement attracted opportunists, and even turned some idealists into opportunists.

Over the generations, black leaders have ranged from noble souls to shameless charlatans. After the success of the civil rights insurgency, the latter have come into their own, gaining money, power and fame by promoting racial attitudes and actions that are counterproductive to the interests of those they lead.

None of this is unique to blacks or to the United States. In various countries and times, leaders of groups that lagged behind, economically and educationally, have taught their followers to blame all their problems on other people — and to hate those other people.

This was the history of anti-Semitic movements in Eastern Europe between the two World Wars, anti-Ibo movements in Nigeria in the 1960s, and anti-Tamil movements that turned Sri Lanka

from a peaceful nation into a scene of lethal mob violence and then decades-long civil war, both marked by unspeakable atrocities.

Groups that rose from poverty to prosperity seldom did so by having racial or ethnic leaders. While most Americans can easily name a number of black leaders, current or past, how many can name Asian American ethnic leaders or Jewish ethnic leaders?

The time is long overdue to stop looking for progress through racial or ethnic leaders. Such leaders have too many incentives to promote polarizing attitudes and actions that are counterproductive for minorities and disastrous for the country.

### Townhall

### [Black Education Tragedy](#)

by Walter E. Williams



As if more evidence were needed about the tragedy of black education, Rachel Jeantel, a witness for the prosecution in the George Zimmerman murder trial, put a face on it for the nation to see. Some of that evidence unfolded when Zimmerman's defense attorney asked 19-year-old Jeantel to read a letter that she allegedly had written to Trayvon Martin's mother. She responded that she doesn't read cursive, and that's in addition to her poor grammar, syntax and communication skills.

Jeantel is a senior at Miami Norland Senior High School. How in the world did she manage to become a 12th-grader without being able to read cursive writing? That's a skill one would expect from a fourth-grader. Jeantel is by no means an exception at her school. Here are a few achievement scores from her school: Thirty-nine percent of the students score basic for reading, and 38 percent score below basic. In math, 37 percent score basic, and 50 percent score below basic. Below basic is the score when a student is unable to demonstrate even partial mastery of knowledge and skills fundamental for proficient work at his grade level. Basic indicates only partial mastery.

Few Americans, particularly black Americans, have any idea of the true magnitude of the black education tragedy. The education establishment might claim that it's not their fault. They're not responsible for the devastation caused by female-headed families, drugs, violence and the culture of dependency. But they are totally responsible for committing gross educational fraud. It's educators who graduated Jeantel from elementary and middle school and continued to pass her along in high school. It's educators who will, in June 2014, confer upon her a high-school diploma.

It's not just Florida's schools. According to the National Assessment of Educational Progress, nationally most black 12th-graders test either basic or below basic in reading, writing, math and science. Drs. Abigail and Stephan Thernstrom wrote in their 2004 book, "No Excuses: Closing the Racial Gap in Learning," "Blacks nearing the end of their high school education perform a little worse than white eighth-graders in both reading and U.S. history, and a lot worse in math and geography." Little has changed since the book's publication.

Drexel University history and political science professor George Ciccariello-Maher disapprovingly says that the reaction to Jeantel's court performance "has been in terms of aesthetics, of disregarding a witness on the basis of how she talks, how good she is at reading and writing." Harking back to Jim Crow days, he adds: "These are subtle things that echo literacy testing at the polls, echo the question of whether black Americans can testify against white people, of being always suspect in their testimony. It's the same old dynamics emerging in a very different guise." Then there's Morgan Polikoff, assistant professor of education at the University of Southern California, who says: "Cursive should be allowed to die. In fact, it's already dying, despite having been taught for decades." That's the kind of educational philosophy that accounts for much of our nation's educational decline.

The educational system and black family structure and culture have combined to make increasing numbers of young black people virtually useless in the increasingly high-tech world of the 21st century. Too many people believe that pouring more money into schools will help. That's whistlin' "Dixie." Whether a student is black or white, poor or rich, there are some minimum requirements that must be met in order to do well in school. Someone must make the student do his homework, see to it that he gets a good night's sleep, fix a breakfast, make sure he gets to school on time and make sure he respects and obeys his teachers. Here are my questions: Which one of those requirements can be achieved through a higher school budget? Which can be achieved by politicians? If those minimal requirements aren't met, whatever else is done is mostly for naught.

I hope Rachel Jeantel's court performance is a wake-up call for black Americans about the devastation wrought by our educational system.

## Power Line

### John Kerry, still clueless after all these years

by Paul Mirengoff



Has the United States ever had a more clueless Secretary of State than John Kerry? Perhaps, but I can't think of one.

Not long ago, James Rosen traveled with Kerry to Egypt, among other places. Kerry met for two and half hours with then-President Mohammed Morsi. According to [Rosen's report](#) in Playboy (yes, Playboy):

Kerry emerged from [the meeting] so persuaded of Morsi's sincerity in pledging to administer the IMF reforms and extend an olive branch to his political opponents that Kerry decided on the spot to unlock \$250 million in frozen U.S. aid.

Within 72 hours [Kerry's aides] informed us that the Egyptian Supreme Court had just canceled the parliamentary elections set for April and that the intentions of Morsi and the Brotherhood were again proving *difficult to discern*.

(Emphasis added)

There are areas in which Kerry's ability to discern is unquestioned — French wine, yachts, and the like. But if one cannot discern the intentions of the Muslim Brotherhood, or worse, discerns them as extending the olive branch to political opponents — one shouldn't dabble in, much less help shape, foreign policy.

Kerry is an old hand at romanticizing anti-American tyrants and would-be tyrants. Most recently, [he perceived](#) Bashar al-Assad as a potential U.S. ally and Middle East peace-broker, prepared to extend the olive branch to Israel.

Kerry isn't totally devoid of the ability to judge character, though. He [figured out](#) that John Edwards was a phony. Then, he made Edwards his choice for Vice President of the United States.



LEADING FROM BEHIND.



Then



Now



garyvarvel.com

MIKE LICKNICH @ajcom  
ATLANTA JOURNAL-  
CONSTITUTION  
7-7-13

HE'S SUCH A VOYEUR...







**Is Anyone Else Seeing This?!**