

February 3, 2014

Mike Huckabee was more stupid than usual last week. [Charles Krauthammer](#) tries to undo some of the damage.

*What is it about women that causes leading Republicans to grow clumsy, if not stupid? When even savvy, fluent, attractively populist Mike Huckabee stumbles, you know you've got trouble. Having already thrown away eminently winnable Senate seats in Missouri and Indiana because of moronic talk about rape, the GOP might have learned. You'd think.*

*Huckabee wasn't quite as egregious, just puzzling and a bit weird. Trying to make a point about Obamacare mandating free contraceptives, he inexplicably began speculating that the reason behind the freebie was the Democrats' belief that women need the federal government to protect them from their own libidos.*

*Bizarre. I can think of no Democrat who has ever said that, nor any liberal who even thinks that. Such a theory, when offered by a conservative, is quite unfortunately self-revealing.*

*In any case, why go wandering into the psychology of female sexuality in the first place? It's ridiculous. This is politics. Stick to policy. And there's a good policy question to be asked about the contraceptive mandate (even apart from its challenge to religious freedom). It's about priorities. By what moral logic does the state provide one woman with co-pay-free contraceptives while denying the same subvention to another woman when she urgently needs antibiotics for her sick child? ...*

[US News OpEd](#), reviewing the coverage of Sarah Palin, GOP, and Wendy Davis, Dem, suggests the real war on women is the mainstream media treatment of Republican women.

*... when National Journal writes that there is a lack of women moving up in GOP leadership – they blame the party. At what point though, do we question the media's double standard against women? What woman in her right mind would want to run the media gauntlet that they'd face running for office as a Republican?*

*I grew up in a family of four girls. There were no limits placed on us as kids; we were never told what we could or couldn't be. In fact, I vividly remember my grandfather telling me that I should become the first woman president.*

*As a single mom to two girls, I find it interesting that I never tell my daughters that they should run for president. Not to say that they'll adopt my political persuasion – but if they did – would I want them to run for office? I don't think so. And it's not because I fear the GOP.*

*Who wants to watch their daughter be subjected to the press? Not this Republican woman.*

**Stephen Moore** tours Grand Rapids and parts of Michigan that are not Detroit. Surprise! Things are going well.

*... This area has long been known for its productive agriculture, landmark companies like Amway, [Steelcase](#) and Herman Miller, and world-class medical facilities such as the Van Andel Research Institute along the "Medical Miracle Mile" off I-96 in Grand Rapids.*

*Still, the region is not fully independent of the boom-and-bust cycles of the domestic auto industry. Many of the local business owners I met grimace when recalling the 30%-50% crash in factory orders during the crisis years of 2008-10.*

*Fred Keller, president of Cascade Engineering, which employs more than 1,000 workers assembling truck and auto parts, recalls how the more senior factory workers volunteered to take lower pay and a cut in hours during the depths of the recession to avoid the misery of layoffs of younger workers with families to support. Others logged extra hours without pay to help pull their employers through the darkest hours of the crisis.*

*This workers-united attitude would rarely be seen in a United Auto Workers plant. But unions are scarce in this part of the state, and that may be a key to its success. Collecting unemployment benefits and welfare is still frowned upon—and the notion in Washington that handouts for doing nothing are an economic "stimulus" draws hearty laughs.*

*Gentex, with its 4,000 employees, is a corporate anchor in the region. The company's skilled workers operate tens of millions of dollars in state-of-the-art machinery. The brain center of the facility is a lab with physicists, chemists and designers who are constantly developing new technologies, such as high-tech dimming windows for airplanes, a new Gentex product line. The company owns more than 600 patents.*

*But Gentex, like most of the state's biggest employers, has had its share of struggles. Fred Bauer, the company's founder and CEO, remembers that when he opened for business in 1974 the office was across the street from a graveyard. "Believe me, there were many times we thought we would end up buried in that cemetery," he says. ...*

**Jonathan Tobin** posts on Scarlett Johansson's pro-Israeli decision between Oxfam and SodaStream.

*The **(Palestinian)** BDS campaign against SodaStream took an unexpected turn yesterday when actress Scarlett Johansson announced her resignation as a representative of Oxfam. The British-based coalition of philanthropic groups had condemned Johansson's role as a commercial spokesperson for SodaStream, an Israeli soda machine manufacturer, because of its location in the Jerusalem suburb of Maale Adumim in the West Bank. Initially, Johansson sought to remain with both organizations, but it was soon clear that she had to choose and released the following statement through a spokesman:*

*"Scarlett Johansson has respectfully decided to end her ambassador role with Oxfam after eight years," the statement said. "She and Oxfam have a fundamental difference of opinion in regards to the boycott, divestment and sanctions movement. She is very proud of her accomplishments and fundraising efforts during her tenure with Oxfam.*

*In response, Oxfam thanked Johansson for her service but made it clear that her decision with SodaStream meant she was no longer welcome:*

*While Oxfam respects the independence of our ambassadors, Ms. Johansson's role promoting the company SodaStream is incompatible with her role as an Oxfam Global Ambassador. Oxfam believes that businesses, such as SodaStream, that operate in settlements further the ongoing poverty and denial of rights of the Palestinian communities that we work to support.*

*Oxfam is opposed to all trade from Israeli settlements, which are illegal under international law. Ms. Johansson has worked with Oxfam since 2005 and in 2007 became a Global Ambassador, helping to highlight the impact of natural disasters and raise funds to save lives and fight poverty.*

*This is a remarkable turn of events. For Johansson, a prominent Hollywood liberal who has campaigned for Democrats and progressive causes, Oxfam was a perfect fit because of her interest in poverty-related causes. But as one of the most visible international charities, it was also a good match for a career in that it added a touch of gravitas to an actress who might otherwise be trivialized as the only woman to be named the sexiest woman in the world by Esquire twice. One might have thought that in terms of an immediate monetary reward, Johansson would choose SodaStream over Oxfam because one pays her and the other doesn't. But in terms of positive publicity and maintaining her status as a member in good standing of the Hollywood liberal establishment, Oxfam might have been the more sensible choice. ...*

**Kudos to Johansson from the editors of The Daily News.**

*Actress Scarlett Johansson should need no introduction. She's glamorous and much in demand as a personality who can lend star power to commercial projects and charitable causes.*

*One of the latter has been Oxfam, a not-for-profit organization that "works to find practical, innovative ways for people to lift themselves out of poverty and thrive." So says its annual report.*

*Now, though, Oxfam has forced Johansson to quit as one of its global ambassadors after she refused to adhere to the rabid, anti-Israel malice of the boycott, divestment and sanctions movement. In stepping down, she sets a powerful moral example. ...*

**And from Jennifer Rubin.**

*... Johansson declared, "SodaStream is a company that is not only committed to the environment but to building a bridge to peace between Israel and Palestine, supporting neighbors working alongside each other, receiving equal pay, equal benefits and equal rights."*

*SodaStream's CEO David Birnbaum responded to the flap: "I'm getting encouragement from her that we should stay the course, and keep on doing the right thing and helping people. She is not only a superhero in her movies, she is a superhero in real life."*

*For standing up for the actual interests of Palestinians and Jews, resisting the BDS bullies and for risking the ire of the anti-Israel left, Johansson deserves praise and support. [SodaStream](#) deserves praise as well, and a bump in sales.*

Heather Mac Donald thinks [Bill de Blasio](#) will re-break NY City's windows.

*Bill de Blasio won the mayoralty of New York by running a [demagogic campaign](#) against the New York Police Department. He has now compounded the injury by dropping the city's appeal of an [equally deceitful court opinion](#) that found that the department's stop, question, and frisk practices deliberately violated the rights of blacks and Hispanics. De Blasio may thus have paved the way for a return to the days of sky-high crime rates.*

*Judge Shira Scheindlin's ruling against the NYPD last August was built on [willful ignorance](#) of crime's racial reality. Scheindlin invented a new concept, "indirect racial profiling," in order to convict the department of unconstitutional policing, despite lacking the evidence to do so. The Second Circuit Court of Appeals [challenged](#) Scheindlin's appearance of impartiality last October when it found that she had steered stop, question, and frisk cases to her courtroom. The Second Circuit panel removed her from the case and stayed her opinion while the city pursued its appeal. Now, however, thanks to de Blasio, Scheindlin's tendentious ruling will stay on the books (unless the NYPD's police unions succeed in their own appeal), setting back the cause of public safety not just in New York, but [across the country](#).*

*The least of the opinion's problems is the unnecessary bureaucracy it inflicts on the NYPD, including a federal monitor, burdensome reporting requirements, and [left-wing advisory panels](#), all overseen by the plaintiffs' attorneys. The most serious problem is Scheindlin's statistical test of racial profiling, which compares police stops to population data, rather than crime data. Scheindlin found the NYPD guilty of biased policing because blacks make up a little over half the subjects of the department's pedestrian stops, though they are just under a quarter of the city's population. She ignored the fact that blacks commit nearly 80 percent of all shootings in New York and two-thirds of all violent crime.*

---

---

---

## Washington Post

### [How to debunk the 'war on women'](#)

by Charles Krauthammer

What is it about women that causes leading Republicans to grow clumsy, if not stupid? When even savvy, fluent, attractively populist Mike Huckabee stumbles, you know you've got trouble. Having already thrown away [eminently winnable Senate seats in Missouri and Indiana](#) because of moronic talk about rape, the GOP might have learned. You'd think.

[Huckabee wasn't quite as egregious](#), just puzzling and a bit weird. Trying to make a point about Obamacare mandating free contraceptives, he inexplicably began speculating that the reason

behind the freebie was the Democrats' belief that women need the federal government to protect them from their own libidos.

Bizarre. I can think of no Democrat who has ever said that, nor any liberal who even thinks that. Such a theory, when offered by a conservative, is quite unfortunately self-revealing.

In any case, why go wandering into the psychology of female sexuality in the first place? It's ridiculous. This is politics. Stick to policy. And there's a good policy question to be asked about the contraceptive mandate (even apart from its [challenge to religious freedom](#)). It's about priorities. By what moral logic does the state provide one woman with co-pay-free contraceptives while denying the same subvention to another woman when she urgently needs antibiotics for her sick child?

The same principle of sticking to policy and forswearing amateur psychology should apply to every so-called women's issue. Take abortion, which is the subtext of about 90 percent of the alleged "war on women," the charge being that those terrible conservative men are denying women control of their reproductive health.

The charge has worked. Although the country is fairly evenly split on the abortion question, the Republicans' inability to make their case in respectful tones has cost them dearly. In 2012, [they lost unmarried women by 36 \(!\) points](#).

Yet there is a very simple, straightforward strategy for seizing the high ground on abortion in a way that transcends the normal divisions and commands wide popular support: Focus on the horror of late-term abortion — and get it banned.

Last year's [Kermit Gosnell trial](#) was a seminal moment. The country was shown a baby butcher at work and national sentiment was nearly unanimous. Abortion-rights advocates ran away from Gosnell. But they can't hide from the issue.

And the issue, as most succinctly defined by the late liberal [Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan](#), is infanticide. Describing one form of late-term abortion known as partial-birth, Moynihan said: "I had once remarked that the procedure was too close to infanticide. And now we have testimony that it is not just too close to infanticide, it is infanticide." How else to describe crushing the infant's skull in mid-delivery before the head leaves the birth canal?

Conservatives need to accept that no such consensus exists regarding early abortions. Unlike late-term abortions, where there are clearly two human beings involved, there is no such agreement regarding, say, a six-week-old embryo.

There remains profound disagreement as to whether, at this early stage, the fetus has acquired personhood or, to put it more theologically, ensoulment. The disagreement is understandable, given that the question is a matter of faith.

This doesn't mean that abortion opponents should give up. But regarding early abortions, the objective should be persuasion — creating some future majority — rather than legislative coercion in the absence of a current majority. These are the constraints of a democratic system.

Not so regarding a third- or late-second-trimester abortion. Here we are dealing with a child that could potentially live on its own — if not killed first. And killing it, for any reason other than to save the mother's life, is an abomination. Outlawing that — state by state and nationally, as was done with partial birth abortion in 2003 — should be the focus of any Republican's position on abortion.

A test case for this kind of policy-oriented political strategy is the governor's race in Texas: [Wendy Davis, the Democratic candidate, has a complicated personal history](#). Stop talking about it. (Her capacity for veracity is a legitimate issue, but for God's sake why go into her parenting choices? That's a snare and a distraction.) Talk policy — specifically, the issue that brought Davis to national prominence.

[What was her 11-hour filibuster about?](#) Blocking a state law whose major feature was outlawing abortions beyond 20 weeks. Make that the battlefield. Make Davis explain why she chose not just to support late-term abortion but to make it her great cause.

Stay away from the minefield of gender politics. Challenge the other side on substance. And watch them lose.

## **US News & World Report**

### **[There Is a War on Women, But Not From Republicans](#)**

#### ***Attacks on Republican women are apparently fair game***

by Dena Battle

It seems you can't visit a news site these days without seeing some kind of headline about the GOP's "War on Women." Whether it's [comments by Mike Huckabee](#) or the NRSC apparently [not promoting women as campaign managers](#) (a charge that was denied by their, um, spokeswoman), it's a favorite subject to report on.

Meanwhile, Politico's magazine is running an opinion piece proclaiming Democrat Texas gubernatorial candidate Wendy Davis "The Most Judged Woman in America." According to Liza Mundy, the U.S. isn't ready for a single mom (a fact you might mention to the many single mothers in Congress). Davis is under attack for inaccuracies in her biography. The article wasn't surprising though — it's not uncommon for the media to write pieces defending women under political attack. Right? Remember all those pieces defending Sarah Palin? Oh wait. Me neither.

It seems that it's perfectly acceptable to attack candidates like Palin, Sharron Angle, Michele Bachmann — call them crazy, stupid, you name it — those are just facts, right? When it's Wendy Davis or Elizabeth Warren, it's politics at its worst — it's the GOP demonizing women once again. A story questioning the authenticity of Sarah Palin's pregnancy is fair game; she made a choice to run for office. But, when Wendy Davis is questioned about whether the dates of her marriage that she publicly disclosed are accurate, it's an attack on single women trying to move up in the world.

This isn't a defense or attack on any of those candidates — Democrats or Republicans. But when National Journal writes that there is a lack of women moving up in GOP leadership — they blame

the party. At what point though, do we question the media's double standard against women? What woman in her right mind would want to run the media gauntlet that they'd face running for office as a Republican?

I grew up in a family of four girls. There were no limits placed on us as kids; we were never told what we could or couldn't be. In fact, I vividly remember my grandfather telling me that I should become the first woman president.

As a single mom to two girls, I find it interesting that I never tell my daughters that they should run for president. Not to say that they'll adopt my political persuasion – but if they did – would I want them to run for office? I don't think so. And it's not because I fear the GOP.

Who wants to watch their daughter be subjected to the press? Not this Republican woman.

**WSJ**

### **[Why the Rest of Michigan Isn't Singing the Motown Blues](#)**

***Unemployment in Detroit was 15.1% at the end of 2013. In the Grand Rapids metro area it was under 6%.***

by Stephen Moore

Bruce Los, vice president of [Gentex](#) Corp., a \$1.2 billion manufacturing company located in tiny Zeeland, Mich. (population 5,508), often hosts executives from foreign auto companies like [BMW](#), and [Toyota](#). With 4,000 employees and a state-of-the-art facility, Gentex makes some of the world's most advanced rearview mirrors, with camera-based driver assistance. After touring the plant, the foreign executives' reaction is always one of amazement: "They say, 'this isn't at all like the Detroit we've read about and see on TV,'" Mr. Los says, laughing.

No, not even close. But the image of bankrupt Detroit is a daunting public-relations challenge here in western Michigan—a region of about one million people that curls around the eastern shore of Lake Michigan. When I met recently with business leaders in Grand Rapids, the unofficial capital of western Michigan, I heard the same refrain again and again: "Detroit is not Michigan. And Michigan isn't Detroit."

The Motor City's meltdown has overshadowed the muscular economic recovery in this region, whose success reflects a manufacturing and technology renaissance. Congress's Joint Economic Committee reports that manufacturers created 600,000 new jobs in 2013, and western Michigan is one of the places where they're sprouting the fastest.



The state overall is in the midst of a broad-based economic recovery. According to a 2013 study of Bureau of Labor Statistics data by the state's Mackinac Center for Public Policy, Michigan has created more than a quarter-million jobs since the official start of the U.S. economic recovery in June 2009—a 7% increase that ranks fifth best in the nation.

Outsiders might attribute the state's turnaround to the federal auto bailouts—President Obama does—but that's a small part of the story. This is a healthy, diversified recovery. According to Mackinac's study, only about 4% of Michigan's four million jobs are auto-related. Even those jobs are at least as dependent on sales to Honda, Toyota and Mercedes as they are on the sales to [GM](#) and Chrysler. International trade is now a big net plus for Michigan. Light manufacturing, information technology and health care have all seen strong job growth.

Some of the credit goes to Republican Gov. Rick Snyder, a low-key, no-nonsense leader who has cut business taxes and shaved spending to balance the highly indebted state budget he inherited. Just over a year ago he signed a right-to-work law that sent a signal to the world that the state was no longer politically captive to unions.

While the unemployment rate at the end of 2013 in Detroit was a sky-high 15.1%, in the Grand Rapids metro area it was just under 6%. Jerry Zandstra, president of Inno-Versity LLC, a Lowell, Mich.-based firm that produces manufacturing training films, says the region needs "more trained engineers, technicians and tradesmen" to meet the demand from thriving local companies.

He adds that Michigan has benefited enormously from America's energy drilling boom that has lowered power costs. Cheap natural gas drilled from the nearby Marcellus Shale is also used as a production feed stock for chemicals and other manufactured products.

This area has long been known for its productive agriculture, landmark companies like Amway, [Steelcase](#) and Herman Miller, and world-class medical facilities such as the Van Andel Research Institute along the "Medical Miracle Mile" off I-96 in Grand Rapids.



Still, the region is not fully independent of the boom-and-bust cycles of the domestic auto industry. Many of the local business owners I met grimace when recalling the 30%-50% crash in factory orders during the crisis years of 2008-10.

Fred Keller, president of Cascade Engineering, which employs more than 1,000 workers assembling truck and auto parts, recalls how the more senior factory workers volunteered to take lower pay and a cut in hours during the depths of the recession to avoid the misery of layoffs of younger workers with families to support. Others logged extra hours without pay to help pull their employers through the darkest hours of the crisis.

This workers-united attitude would rarely be seen in a United Auto Workers plant. But unions are scarce in this part of the state, and that may be a key to its success. Collecting unemployment benefits and welfare is still frowned upon—and the notion in Washington that handouts for doing nothing are an economic "stimulus" draws hearty laughs.

Gentex, with its 4,000 employees, is a corporate anchor in the region. The company's skilled workers operate tens of millions of dollars in state-of-the-art machinery. The brain center of the facility is a lab with physicists, chemists and designers who are constantly developing new technologies, such as high-tech dimming windows for airplanes, a new Gentex product line. The company owns more than 600 patents.

But Gentex, like most of the state's biggest employers, has had its share of struggles. Fred Bauer, the company's founder and CEO, remembers that when he opened for business in 1974 the office was across the street from a graveyard. "Believe me, there were many times we thought we would end up buried in that cemetery," he says.

The tenacity of Gentex to survive the hard times and find a way to flourish is symbolic of the never-say-die spirit of this region. Those who complain that "Americans don't make anything anymore" haven't been to western Michigan, where some of the highest-quality manufactured products in the world are shipped world-wide. That's the big unheralded recovery story in Michigan, and it's happening nearly everywhere in the state—outside of Detroit.

*Mr. Moore, a former member of the Journal's editorial board, is chief economist at the Heritage Foundation.*

## Contentions

### [Will ScarJo Pay a Price for Her Principles?](#)

by Jonathan S. Tobin

The **(Palestinian)** BDS campaign against SodaStream took an unexpected turn yesterday [when actress Scarlett Johansson announced](#) her resignation as a representative of Oxfam. The British-based coalition of philanthropic groups had condemned Johansson's role as a commercial spokesperson for SodaStream, an Israeli soda machine manufacturer, because of its location in the Jerusalem suburb of Maale Adumim in the West Bank. Initially, Johansson sought to remain with both organizations, but it was soon clear that she had to choose and released the following statement through a spokesman:

"Scarlett Johansson has respectfully decided to end her ambassador role with Oxfam after eight years," the statement said. "She and Oxfam have a fundamental difference of opinion in regards

to the boycott, divestment and sanctions movement. She is very proud of her accomplishments and fundraising efforts during her tenure with Oxfam.

In response, Oxfam thanked Johansson for her service but made it clear that her decision with SodaStream meant she was no longer welcome:

While Oxfam respects the independence of our ambassadors, Ms. Johansson's role promoting the company SodaStream is incompatible with her role as an Oxfam Global Ambassador. Oxfam believes that businesses, such as SodaStream, that operate in settlements further the ongoing poverty and denial of rights of the Palestinian communities that we work to support.

Oxfam is opposed to all trade from Israeli settlements, which are illegal under international law. Ms. Johansson has worked with Oxfam since 2005 and in 2007 became a Global Ambassador, helping to highlight the impact of natural disasters and raise funds to save lives and fight poverty.

This is a remarkable turn of events. For Johansson, a prominent Hollywood liberal who has campaigned for Democrats and progressive causes, Oxfam was a perfect fit because of her interest in poverty-related causes. But as one of the most visible international charities, it was also a good match for a career in that it added a touch of *gravitas* to an actress who might otherwise be trivialized as the only woman to be named the sexiest woman in the world by *Esquire* twice. One might have thought that in terms of an immediate monetary reward, Johansson would choose SodaStream over Oxfam because one pays her and the other doesn't. But in terms of positive publicity and maintaining her status as a member in good standing of the Hollywood liberal establishment, Oxfam might have been the more sensible choice.

In sticking with SodaStream, Johansson will win the praise of many Americans, especially fellow Jews, but it opens a new and potentially bitter chapter in the struggle by the BDS movement against Israel. The question facing the actress as well as friends of the Jewish state is whether her decision will herald more defeats for those seeking to isolate Israel or will instead provide a new focus for a BDS movement that is gaining support in Europe even as it remains marginal in the United States.

It is possible that Oxfam's decision wasn't entirely based on the anti-Israel bias of its London-based leadership. One of the leading corporate donors to Oxfam just happens to be the Coca Cola Company that has given millions to the group. That tie between a company that can be linked to obesity and bad nutrition and a charity that promotes feeding the hungry [is seen as a contradiction by some](#) and only explained by the cash that flows from Coke to Oxfam. But the fact that SodaStream is a competitor that is already eating into Coke's market share could account, at least in part, for Oxfam's speed in denouncing Johansson.

But even if contributions from Coke had nothing to do with Oxfam's decision, the most important conclusion to be drawn from the way this controversy developed is the ease and speed with which a theoretically apolitical charity like Oxfam publicly embraced the BDS stand even though it meant losing the services of such an effective ambassador as Johansson. The decisiveness and alacrity with which Oxfam's leaders condemned her ties with an Israeli company may well have come as a rude shock to Johansson after she signed on to appear in SodaStream commercials, including one scheduled for broadcast during the Super Bowl. Though she is an active supporter of many liberal causes who embraced Oxfam because of its apparent

compatibility with her personal values, it may not have occurred to her that in international progressive circles such associations with Israel aren't kosher.

The point here is not simply the factual inaccuracy of Oxfam's accusations that settlements further Palestinian poverty or deny Palestinian rights. Having seen SodaStream's operations herself, Johansson knew that [charges that it exploited its Arab workers](#) were nothing but propaganda and absurd lies. She rightly understood that its owners were committed peaceniks who genuinely believe that the cooperative and mutually profitable relations between Jews and Arabs that go on at SodaStream are exactly what the region needs. But in the world of Oxfam, opposition to West Bank settlements isn't about what's good for the Palestinians. The factory's location, a few miles from Jerusalem's city limits in territory that almost certainly would be incorporated into Israel in the event of a peace treaty, is merely an excuse to continue a campaign of delegitimization against the Jewish state. And in that struggle, there can be no exceptions or even any grey areas where people of good conscience may differ.

The arrogant moral certainty of Oxfam's statement simply assumes that the presence of Jews in what is, under international law, disputed territory rather than that of a sovereign state, is repugnant. That is exactly the mindset of BDSers whose purpose is not aiding poor Palestinians but to further impoverish them by destroying businesses that provide them with income and an opportunity to better themselves that is largely denied them by the corrupt governments led by both the Palestinian Authority and Hamas in the West Bank and Gaza.

But now that Johansson has rejected the leftist groupthink of Oxfam that assumes the Jewish state to be beyond the pale, it remains to be seen whether there will be a price to be paid for her principled choice. [As I noted earlier this week](#), it is possible that in the future Johansson may become the focus of a concerted boycott by Israel-haters. Though their efforts won't put even a minor dent in her career prospects in the United States, it is entirely possible that she will become better known in Europe and Asia as a supporter of Israel than as a gifted A-list actress. The implications of such a development would not be trivial for film producers who increasingly rely on international markets to realize profits, nor for other companies seeking film stars to promote their products.

If Johansson had abandoned SodaStream it would have signaled an immediate and high-visibility victory for the BDS campaign, certainly its most important victory in the United States. But having cast her lot with defenders of the Jewish state, the actress must understand that this isn't the end of the story. She may have thought her work for Oxfam gave her common ground with progressives in Europe and around the globe. But she may now discover that, from this day forward, they will only see her as a public figure to be rejected and shunned as a principled Jew who stands with Israel.

## **NY Daily News**

### **[Scarlett gives a damn](#)**

***Johansson takes a bold stand against the anti-Israel BDS movement.***

Actress Scarlett Johansson should need no introduction. She's glamorous and much in demand as a personality who can lend star power to commercial projects and charitable causes.

One of the latter has been Oxfam, a not-for-profit organization that “works to find practical, innovative ways for people to lift themselves out of poverty and thrive.” So says its annual report.

Now, though, Oxfam has forced Johansson to quit as one of its global ambassadors after she refused to adhere to the rabid, anti-Israel malice of the boycott, divestment and sanctions movement. In stepping down, she sets a powerful moral example.

Associated with Oxfam since 2007, Johansson more recently became a paid spokesperson for SodaStream, the makers of a device that lets you make your own seltzer, cola, ginger ale, whatever. You have likely seen the company’s commercials.

Oxfam went off the dial because SodaStream happens to be an Israeli business — and, worse, because the company has a factory in an industrial park near a West Bank settlement. That makes SodaStream a pariah to Oxfam, which subscribes to the borderline anti-Semitic movement that is seeking to undermine the very existence of the Jewish state by calling for a trade boycott.

Oxfam opposes all trade from Israeli settlements. In its zealotry, the group dismisses the fact that this factory — one of 25 run by SodaStream worldwide — employs more than 1,300 people, including about 500 Palestinians. Those Palestians would bear the brunt if a boycott succeeded.

“Before boycotting, they should think of the workers who are going to suffer,” a young man told the Christian Science Monitor. He had gone from earning \$6 a day plucking chickens to making almost 10 times as much at SodaStream.

Blinded by the BDS crusade, Oxfam sacrificed an ally devoted to helping starving children to a litmus test that it applies to no other nation.

Companies do business in China, which imprisons dissidents by the thousands. Companies trade with Bangladesh, where workers in dangerous factories have died by the hundreds. Only Israel, which protects basic human and civil and economic rights, is forbidden territory.

With a strong, clear stand — calmly citing “fundamental difference of opinion” — Johansson becomes the highest-profile celebrity to buck the load of BDS bull. Ever more power to her, and to those who may follow her example

**Right Turn**  
**[Distinguished pol of the week](#)**  
by Jennifer Rubin

She isn’t a pol, strictly speaking, but maybe she should be if the acting thing doesn’t pan out. Actress Scarlett Johansson has been a promoter/ad gal for SodaStream, the Israeli company that operates in the West Bank. SodaStream is under fire from the anti-Israel crowd, the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) movement, which wants to boycott Israeli goods,

academics and more. Like most of what the BDS movement does, its actions against SodaStream would hurt the Palestinians.



*Scarlett Johansson, in SodaStream's 2014 Super Bowl commercial.*

SodaStream hires about 500 Palestinians at wages far higher than other employers. Like a number of factories in the West Bank, Palestinians and Jews work together. *This plainly cannot go on!* Johansson would have none of this. Not only did she stick by SodaStream but she broke off ties with the aid group Oxfam, a leader in the BDS movement and [backer](#) of projects by other phony NGOs that seek to delegitimize the Jewish state. Johansson declared, "SodaStream is a company that is not only committed to the environment but to building a bridge to peace between Israel and Palestine, supporting neighbors working alongside each other, receiving equal pay, equal benefits and equal rights."

SodaStream's CEO David Birnbaum [responded to the flap](#): "I'm getting encouragement from her that we should stay the course, and keep on doing the right thing and helping people. She is not only a superhero in her movies, she is a superhero in real life."

For standing up for the actual interests of Palestinians and Jews, resisting the BDS bullies and for risking the ire of the anti-Israel left, Johansson deserves praise and support. [SodaStream](#) deserves praise as well, and a bump in sales.

## City Journal

### [Re-breaking the Windows](#)

***Mayor de Blasio's decision to settle the NYPD lawsuit threatens the city's triumph over crime.***

by Heather Mac Donald

Bill de Blasio won the mayoralty of New York by running a [demagogic campaign](#) against the New York Police Department. He has now compounded the injury by dropping the city's appeal of an [equally deceitful court opinion](#) that found that the department's stop, question, and frisk practices deliberately violated the rights of blacks and Hispanics. De Blasio may thus have paved the way for a return to the days of sky-high crime rates.

Judge Shira Scheindlin's ruling against the NYPD last August was built on [willful ignorance](#) of crime's racial reality. Scheindlin invented a new concept, "indirect racial profiling," in order to convict the department of unconstitutional policing, despite lacking the evidence to do so. The Second Circuit Court of Appeals [challenged](#) Scheindlin's appearance of impartiality last October when it found that she had steered stop, question, and frisk cases to her courtroom. The Second Circuit panel removed her from the case and stayed her opinion while the city pursued its appeal. Now, however, thanks to de Blasio, Scheindlin's tendentious ruling will stay on the books (unless the NYPD's police unions succeed in their own appeal), setting back the cause of public safety not just in New York, but [across the country](#).

The least of the opinion's problems is the unnecessary bureaucracy it inflicts on the NYPD, including a federal monitor, burdensome reporting requirements, and [left-wing advisory panels](#), all overseen by the plaintiffs' attorneys. The most serious problem is Scheindlin's statistical test of racial profiling, which compares police stops to population data, rather than crime data. Scheindlin found the NYPD guilty of biased policing because blacks make up a little over half the subjects of the department's pedestrian stops, though they are just under a quarter of the city's population. She ignored the fact that blacks commit nearly 80 percent of all shootings in New York and two-thirds of all violent crime.

It's little surprise that de Blasio chose not to fight Scheindlin's dangerously misguided opinion, beholden as he is to the city's advocacy groups. (A more imaginative statesman would have implemented many of Scheindlin's gratuitous "reforms," then asked the judge currently overseeing the case to throw it out on the grounds that it was now moot.) More disappointing is that William Bratton, just starting a second tour as NYPD commissioner, has acquiesced in de Blasio's political theater. "We will not break the law to enforce the law," Bratton said in a press release. Bratton's longtime rival, Ray Kelly, the NYPD's previous commissioner and the target of Bratton's comment, would undoubtedly agree with that sentiment.

But Bratton may regret his stance. No police chief can fight crime without generating the racially disparate enforcement statistics that lie at the heart of Scheindlin's newly justified ruling. It will take some time for New York's criminals to conclude that their stop risk has really and truly dropped, thanks to the implementation of Scheindlin's opinion. But when they do figure that out, Bratton's most potent weapon against the inevitable rise in lawlessness will be the proactive stops that he now implies are unlawful.

Nothing has been more important to the revival of New York than the conquest of crime. New York's unprecedented crime drop is the greatest urban success story of the last half-century, one that should be seized upon by every conservative politician searching for a government program to support. But if New Yorkers once again fear walking home at night from the subway, if tourists worry about getting to their hotel after a concert or a show, expect the folly of electing a mayor who thought he could play politics with public safety to become clear.

*Heather Mac Donald is a contributing editor of City Journal and the John M. Olin Fellow at the Manhattan Institute. She is the author of [Are Cops Racist?: How the War Against the Police Harms Black Americans](#).*

# VOTING LIBERAL



Thought about being a  
Liberal once,  
but decided I  
can't drink that  
much Kool-Aid.



someecards  
user card

# THREE BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT



CREATORS SYNDICATE  
2 0 1 4

SKILLY

