

April 28, 2014

George Will writes on the adolescent president.

*Recently, Barack Obama — a Demosthenes determined to elevate our politics from coarseness to elegance; a Pericles sent to ameliorate our rhetorical impoverishment — spoke at the University of Michigan. He came to that very friendly venue — in 2012, he received 67 percent of the vote in Ann Arbor's county — after visiting a local sandwich shop, where a muse must have whispered in the presidential ear. Rep. Paul Ryan (R-Wis.) had recently released his budget, so Obama expressed his disapproval by calling it, for the benefit of his academic audience, a “meanwich” and a “stinkburger.”*

*Try to imagine Franklin Roosevelt or Dwight Eisenhower or John Kennedy or Ronald Reagan talking like that. It is unimaginable that those grown-ups would resort to japes that fourth-graders would not consider sufficiently clever for use on a playground. ...*

*... he talks like an arrested-development adolescent.*

*Anyone who has tried to engage a member of that age cohort in an argument probably recognizes the four basic teenage tropes, which also are the only arrows in Obama's overrated rhetorical quiver. He employed them all last week when he went to the White House briefing room to exclaim, as he is wont to do, about the excellence of the Affordable Care Act.*

*First came the invocation of a straw man. Celebrating the ACA's enrollment numbers, Obama, referring to Republicans, charged: “They said nobody would sign up.” Of course, no one said this. Obama often is what political philosopher Kenneth Minogue said of an adversary — “a pyromaniac in a field of straw men.” ..*

In normal times the unfortunate unintended consequences of a president's bad policies take years to unfold. And usually this is after the miscreant is safely out of office. But this president is so abysmally ignorant, the bad effects of his foolishness have borne fruit during his time in office. Of course, this would not be the case if the media was not in the tank for him. But they are. So to its everlasting shame, the American public returned him to office. The bright side is we get to see him try to construct ways to fix the problems he created with his special brand of left-wing stupidity.

From the WSJ Editors we learned of efforts to fix the student loan program taken over in the affordable care act. I know it as nothing to do with health care, but it has a lot to do with increasing federal power.

*The federal student loan program is becoming so costly to taxpayers that even President Obama is pretending to fix it. Readers will recall Mr. Obama as the man who has spent much of his Presidency expanding this program, creating new ways for borrowers to avoid repayment, and then campaigning about these dubious achievements on campuses nationwide.*

*Now Team Obama is acknowledging that his policies are turning out to be more expensive than he claimed. Participation in federal debt-forgiveness programs is surging. In a mere six months the number of borrowers who've signed up for such plans has increased to more than 1.3 million from*

*less than a million, with total balances rising to \$72 billion from \$52 billion. Maybe the White House didn't understand that when you give people an economic incentive not to repay a loan, more people won't repay.*

*Taxpayers can suffer in many ways from federal education lending, because most loans are issued regardless of a borrower's ability to repay. So loose is this form of credit that in the slow-growth Obama economy it has become a vehicle to fund basic living expenses, with tens of thousands of borrowers consuming aid even when they're not enrolled for courses. ...*

Even this corrupt media can't cover for the fool forever. Time has this on his foreign policy;

*In a rough month of a rough year of a rough second term for Barack Obama's foreign policy, Thursday was a particularly rough day.*

*It began with dour news from the Middle East. Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu declared that he won't negotiate with a unified Palestinian government that includes both moderate Fatah and radical Gaza-based Hamas. Shorter version: the already-gasping Middle East peace process is likely dead for the remainder of Obama's presidency.*

*The day ended with Secretary of State John Kerry's angry speech accusing Russia of violating the diplomatic agreement Kerry co-signed a week ago in Geneva, ...*

And the NY Times has this;

*TOKYO — President Obama encountered setbacks to two of his most cherished foreign-policy projects on Thursday, as he failed to achieve a trade deal that undergirds his strategic pivot to Asia and the Middle East peace process suffered a potentially irreparable breakdown.*

*Mr. Obama had hoped to use his visit here to announce an agreement under which Japan would open its markets in rice, beef, poultry and pork, a critical step toward the Trans-Pacific Partnership, the proposed regional trade pact. But Prime Minister Shinzo Abe was not able to overcome entrenched resistance from Japan's farmers in time for the president's visit.*

*In Jerusalem, Israel's announcement that it was suspending stalemated peace negotiations with the Palestinians, after a reconciliation between the Palestine Liberation Organization and the militant group Hamas, posed yet another obstacle to restarting a troubled peace process in which Secretary of State John Kerry has been greatly invested.*

*The setbacks, though worlds apart in geography and history, speak to the common challenge Mr. Obama has had in translating his ideas and ambitions into enduring policies. He has watched outside forces unravel his best-laid plans, from resetting relations with Russia to managing the epochal political change in the Arab world. On Thursday, as Russia staged military exercises on the border with Ukraine, Mr. Kerry denounced broken promises from the Kremlin but took no specific action. ...*

**Jennifer Rubin** says the first term set all these problems in motion. Once we get these fools out of Washington, it will take decades to clean up the mess.

*... We can draw a number of conclusions from all of this. First, the disasters may be popping up now, but it is hard to argue that the first term did not set in motion (by inaction in Syria, a faulty arms deal with Russia, contentious relations with Israel) the failures we see now playing out. For that, the president and his first-term national security team are directly responsible. Second, the left- and right-wing dream that the United States could recede and let others deal with their problems proved once again just plain wrong. Third, the adage that small steps early can obviate the need for big, costly commitments later on has been borne out in Syria. Fourth, the United States needs a president fully engaged in national security who can assess how U.S. actions are interpreted by others. Finally, when things get worse (first Crimea and then Ukraine, a few hundred dead and eventually over 150,000 dead in Syria) they will continue to get worse until we try something new. Passivity is a recipe for chaos, instability and violence. In Europe, for the first time since the Cold War the sovereignty of U.S. allies is at risk.*

*We can therefore expect additional crises, more aggressive behavior and less cooperation from allies as they assess American fecklessness. The president who wanted to rid the world of nukes is convincing Sunni monarchs and Eastern European countries that it is foolish to rely on the American nuclear umbrella. How many countries will insist on their own arsenal to protect themselves against Russia, China or Iran?*

*When Republicans choose their candidate for commander in chief, they'd be wise to pick someone who understood this all along — not simply when it all went haywire in 2014.*

Turning to another execrable miscreant, **Fred Barnes** writes on Harry Reid.

*The Romney strategy is back. Not the flawed campaign plan of Mitt Romney for the 2012 election, but the effort by President Obama and Democrats to malign Romney, even before he'd become the GOP nominee, as morally unfit for the presidency.*

*Now the strategy is focused on Republican Senate candidates, some of them still running in contested primaries. From Democratic TV ads, we learn that Dan Sullivan in Alaska may not be "one of us," a true Alaskan. Tom Cotton in Arkansas, having worked for insurance companies, is "a politician we just can't trust." And Bill Cassidy in Louisiana sought to "cut off hurricane relief for Louisiana families."*

*There's a name for this strategy—the politics of personal destruction. It was successful in 2012 in transforming Romney's image into that of an uncaring, greedy corporate boss who made millions while shutting down companies and throwing workers out of jobs. In one Obama ad, Romney was falsely blamed for the cancer death of a worker's wife.*

*The chief practitioner of the Romney strategy today is Senate majority leader Harry Reid, who is desperate to keep Republicans from taking control of the Senate in the November midterm elections. The ads are the handiwork of Reid's Senate Majority PAC or its sister organization, the Patriot Majority PAC.*

*What's striking is their emphasis on personal matters rather than major public issues like health care or the economy and their frequent inaccuracy. Cotton, for example, has never worked for an insurance company. Nor did Cassidy seek to curb disaster relief.*

**Scott Johnson** posts a Reid summary.

*It seems to me that in Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid we have something new under the sun. He revives old-fashioned, LBJ-style corruption in office, as Adam O'Neal's [understated RCP column suggests](#). He brings pure partisan prevarication and hackery to his office, as Fred Barnes suggests in "[Mudslinger in chief](#)." And he disgraces the institution that he leads, as Victor Davis Hanson judges in "[A McCarthy for our time](#)."*

*Liberal commentators observe Reid's shenanigans in the spirit of detached amusement. In this respect [Chris Cillizza is representative](#). It's the best he and they can do, but it is pathetic.*

*If that's the best Cillizza can do as a supposed political junkie — if the chairman of the Republican National Committee is [a truer guide](#) to the Reid phenomenon than Cillizza — it's time for him and his ilk to pursue other opportunities.*

*As Senate Majority Leader, Harry Reid has brought his office to an unprecedented low. There is no lie he will not recite, no libel he will resist so long as it advances some narrow partisan purpose. As Majority Leader, he holds the mirror up to President Obama. They illuminate each other. It's not a pretty sight. ...*

---

---

---

## Washington Post

### [Barack Obama, the adolescent president](#)

by George F. Will

Recently, Barack Obama — a Demosthenes determined to elevate our politics from coarseness to elegance; a Pericles sent to ameliorate our rhetorical impoverishment — spoke at the University of Michigan. He came to that very friendly venue — in 2012, he received [67 percent of the vote in Ann Arbor's county](#) — after visiting a local sandwich shop, where a muse must have whispered in the presidential ear. Rep. □ Paul Ryan (R-Wis.) had recently released his budget, so [Obama expressed his disapproval](#) by calling it, for the benefit of his academic audience, a “meanwich” and a “stinkburger.”

Try to imagine Franklin Roosevelt or Dwight Eisenhower or John Kennedy or Ronald Reagan talking like that. It is unimaginable that those grown-ups would resort to japes that fourth-graders would not consider sufficiently clever for use on a playground.

When Theodore Roosevelt was president, one of his good friends — he had been [best man at TR's 1886 wedding](#) — was the [British diplomat Cecil Spring Rice](#). So, when visitors to Washington

wanted to learn about TR, they asked Rice about him, and Springie, as TR called him, would say: [“You must always remember that the president is about 6.”](#) Today’s president is older than that. But he talks like an arrested-development adolescent.

Anyone who has tried to engage a member of that age cohort in an argument probably recognizes the four basic teenage tropes, which also are the only arrows in Obama’s overrated rhetorical quiver. He employed them all last week when [he went to the White House briefing room](#) to exclaim, as he is wont to do, about the excellence of the Affordable Care Act.

First came the invocation of a straw man. Celebrating the ACA’s enrollment numbers, Obama, referring to Republicans, charged: “They said nobody would sign up.” Of course, no one said this. Obama often is what [political philosopher Kenneth Minogue](#) said of an adversary — “a pyromaniac in a field of straw men.”

Adolescents also try to truncate arguments by saying that nothing remains of any arguments against their arguments. Regarding the ACA, Obama said the debate is “settled” and “over.” Progressives also say the debate about catastrophic consequences of man-made climate change is “over,” so everyone should pipe down. And they say the debates about the efficacy of universal preschool, and the cost-benefit balance of a minimum-wage increase, are over. Declaring an argument over is so much more restful than engaging with evidence.

A third rhetorical move by argumentative adolescents is to declare that there is nothing to argue about because everything is going along swimmingly. Seven times Obama asserted that the ACA is “working.” That is, however, uninformative because it is ambiguous. The ethanol program is “working” in the sense that it is being implemented as its misguided architects intended. Nevertheless, the program is a substantial net subtraction from the nation’s well-being. The same can be said of sugar import quotas, or agriculture subsidies generally, or many hundreds of other government programs that are, unfortunately, “working.”

Finally, the real discussion-stopper for the righteous — and there is no righteousness like an adolescent’s — is an assertion that has always been an Obama specialty. It is that there cannot be honorable and intelligent disagreement with him. So last week, less than two minutes after saying that the argument about the ACA “isn’t about me,” Obama said some important opposition to the ACA is about him, citing “states that have chosen not to expand Medicaid for no other reason than political spite.”

This, he said, must be spiteful because expanding Medicaid involves “zero cost to these states.” Well. The federal government does pay the full cost of expansion — for three years. After that, however, states will pay up to 10 percent of the expansion’s costs, which itself will be a large sum. And the 10 percent figure has not been graven on stone by the finger of God. It can be enlarged whenever Congress wants, as surely it will, to enable more federal spending by imposing more burdens on the states. Yet Obama, who aspired to tutor Washington about civility, is incapable of crediting opponents with other than base motives.

About one thing Obama was right, if contradictory. He said Americans want politicians to talk about other subjects — but that Democrats should campaign by celebrating the wondrousness of the ACA. This would be candid because it is what progressivism is — a top-down, continent-wide tissue of taxes, mandates and other coercions. Is the debate about it over? Not quite.

**WSJ - Editors**

## **Telling Students to Earn Less**

***Obama now calls for reforming his bleeding college loan program.***

The federal student loan program is becoming so costly to taxpayers that even President Obama is pretending to fix it. Readers will recall Mr. Obama as the man who has spent much of his Presidency expanding this program, creating new ways for borrowers to avoid repayment, and then campaigning about these dubious achievements on campuses nationwide.

Now Team Obama is acknowledging that his policies are turning out to be more expensive than he claimed. Participation in federal debt-forgiveness programs is surging. In a mere six months the number of borrowers who've signed up for such plans has increased to more than 1.3 million from less than a million, with total balances rising to \$72 billion from \$52 billion. Maybe the White House didn't understand that when you give people an economic incentive not to repay a loan, more people won't repay.

Taxpayers can suffer in many ways from federal education lending, because most loans are issued regardless of a borrower's ability to repay. So loose is this form of credit that in the slow-growth Obama economy it has become a vehicle to fund basic living expenses, with tens of thousands of borrowers consuming aid even when they're not enrolled for courses.

But the immediate taxpayer S.O.S. concerns Mr. Obama's Pay As You Earn program. We've warned for years about the risks of this program as Mr. Obama has worked to expand the number of eligible borrowers and sweeten its terms.

Pay As You Earn allows students under certain circumstances to borrow an unlimited amount and then cap monthly payments at 10% of their discretionary income. If they choose productive work in the private economy, the loans are forgiven after 20 years. But if they choose to work in government or for a nonprofit, Uncle Sugar forgives their loans after 10 years.

For aspiring community organizers who go to college and then grad school before moving into a job that the government defines as public service, the forgiven debt can be \$150,000 or more, courtesy of the taxpayer. And unlike with some other federal programs, when the government forgives the debt of one of the exalted class of nonprofit or government workers, the do-gooder doesn't have to report it as income to the IRS. Who wouldn't want to pick up \$150,000 tax-free?

Energized by Mr. Obama's 2011 expansion, Pay As You Earn has been a slow-motion bailout for law schools, which saw diminishing applications in the wake of the financial crisis. Now the money is still rolling in thanks to more leveraged students. Upon graduation the median law school grad in 2012 was carrying more than \$128,000 in grad-school debt, up from \$77,000 in 2004.

But how much of it will ever be repaid? At least one creative school, Georgetown, last year offered to pay the students' monthly bills under the Pay As You Earn program while simultaneously raising tuitions. This essentially makes taxpayers pay the entire cost and turns the loans into six-figure grants.

The White House is finally admitting there's a problem, albeit sotto voce. The President's 2015 budget proposes to "reform the [Pay As You Earn] terms to ensure that the program is well-targeted and provides a safeguard against rising tuition at high-cost institutions." But it seems the

White House is more concerned with the appearances of this taxpayer fleecing than the reality. Later in the budget tables the White House notes that its plan to "expand and reform student loan income-based repayment" will cost taxpayers even more than the status quo—by more than \$3.5 billion over 10 years.

As for the status quo, Jason Delisle of the New America Foundation has been tracking the expanding red ink. He notes that in 2010 when the President first sketched out the idea for Pay As You Earn, the cost of permitting past borrowers to use the program's "more generous terms was approximately \$1.7 billion. The administration reported the cost for the same proposal in 2013 as approximately \$3.5 billion. In 2014 it quoted the cost at approximately \$7.6 billion." Look for the estimates to keep rising—especially after this fall's election.

This might seem like a windfall for the students, but the only clear winners are the universities that are the ultimate recipients of the taxpayer money. While the students may technically get the freebie, the impressionable youngsters, who likely have little or no wealth, are being given an enormous financial incentive to pursue careers in government or at low-paying nonprofits.

The consequences for our economy are no less tragic than for the individual borrowers. They are being driven away from the path down which their natural ambition and talent might have taken them. President Obama keeps talking about reducing income equality. So why does he keep paying young people not to pursue higher incomes?

## Time

### [Obama's Foreign Policy Failures Are Proving His Critics Right](#)

*The President once promised to tackle "cynicism" about what could be achieved through diplomacy. But he's nowhere near close to doing that*

by Michael Crowley

In a rough month of a rough year of a rough second term for Barack Obama's foreign policy, Thursday was a particularly rough day.

It began with dour news from the Middle East. Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu declared that he won't negotiate with a unified Palestinian government that includes both moderate Fatah and radical Gaza-based Hamas. Shorter version: the already-gasping Middle East peace process is likely dead for the remainder of Obama's presidency.

The day ended with Secretary of State John Kerry's angry speech [accusing](#) Russia of violating the diplomatic agreement Kerry co-signed a week ago in Geneva, supposedly stabilizing the crisis in eastern Ukraine. But things seem to be getting worse in Ukraine, more U.S. sanctions against Moscow appear likely, and Vladimir Putin may be gearing up for [military action](#).

President Obama was in Japan as these things happened — part of his effort to sell the "pivot to Asia." It was good news, of a sort, that Obama finally managed to visit the region after two prior cancelled trips. Yet problems elsewhere felt more urgent. At a press conference in Tokyo, Obama found himself talking about Kiev and Moscow and Damascus. And on one of his key goals — striking a new trade agreement with Japan — he would leave the country [empty-handed](#). ...**(Follow the link if you want to read more.)**

## NY Times

### [Obama Suffers Setbacks in Japan and the Mideast](#)

by Mark Landler and Jodi Rudoren

TOKYO — President Obama encountered setbacks to two of his most cherished foreign-policy projects on Thursday, as he failed to achieve a trade deal that undergirds his strategic pivot to Asia and the Middle East peace process suffered a potentially irreparable breakdown.

Mr. Obama had hoped to use his visit here to announce an agreement under which Japan would open its markets in rice, beef, poultry and pork, a critical step toward the Trans-Pacific Partnership, the proposed regional trade pact. But Prime Minister Shinzo Abe was not able to overcome entrenched resistance from Japan's farmers in time for the president's visit.

In Jerusalem, [Israel's announcement](#) that it was suspending stalemated peace negotiations with the Palestinians, after [a reconciliation](#) between the Palestine Liberation Organization and the militant group Hamas, posed yet another obstacle to restarting a troubled peace process in which Secretary of State John Kerry has been greatly invested.

The setbacks, though worlds apart in geography and history, speak to the common challenge Mr. Obama has had in translating his ideas and ambitions into enduring policies. He has watched outside forces unravel his best-laid plans, from resetting relations with Russia to managing the epochal political change in the Arab world. On Thursday, as Russia [staged military exercises](#) on the border with Ukraine, Mr. Kerry denounced broken promises from the Kremlin but took no specific action. ...**(Follow the link if you want to read more.)**

## Right Turn

### [Obama's foreign policy disasters have only begun](#)

by Jennifer Rubin

The Obama administration's foreign policy is a disaster. [The Post headline reads](#): "U.S., Japan fail to reach trade deal on Obama trip." The [New York Times blasts](#): "Barack Obama suffers setbacks in Japan and the Mideast." The report needles: "On Thursday, as Russia staged military exercises on the border with Ukraine, [Secretary of State John] Kerry denounced broken promises from the Kremlin but took no specific action."

At Time magazine, [Michael Crowley](#) takes a sledgehammer to the Obama team: "Obama's Foreign Policy Failures Are Proving His Critics Right." He explains:

[T]he cynics must be feeling vindicated. They snickered at John Kerry's bid for Middle East peace, calling it doomed to fail. They seem to have been right. They have also chortled at Kerry's long meetings with Russia's Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov, calling diplomacy with Vladimir Putin a fool's errand. The impending collapse of the Ukraine deal struck in Geneva last night would seem to affirm that view.

The cynics also doubting Obama's Asia pivot, seeing it as a futile attempt to dodge harder problems elsewhere. Obama's distracted trip this week is at least a point in their favor.



And they argue that Obama's aversion to getting involved in Syria is not only a humanitarian tragedy but will cause deeper problems for the U.S. in the long run. A new chemical weapons crisis would be a good example.

On this, the president can't blame the Republicans. In the first term he set a pattern — soaring rhetoric, ending hard power commitments coupled with big defense cuts, refusal to take on totalitarian governments on human rights, solicitous behavior toward Iran and Russia. It didn't work — **anywhere**.

We can draw a number of conclusions from all of this. First, the disasters may be popping up now, but it is hard to argue that the first term did not set in motion (by inaction in Syria, a faulty arms deal with Russia, contentious relations with Israel) the failures we see now playing out. For that, the president and his first-term national security team are directly responsible. Second, the left- and right-wing dream that the United States could recede and let others deal with their problems proved once again just plain wrong. Third, the adage that small steps early can obviate the need for big, costly commitments later on has been borne out in Syria. Fourth, the United States needs a president fully engaged in national security who can assess how U.S. actions are interpreted by others. Finally, when things get worse (first Crimea and then Ukraine, a few hundred dead and eventually over 150,000 dead in Syria) they will continue to get worse until we try something new. Passivity is a recipe for chaos, instability and violence. In Europe, for the first time since the Cold War the sovereignty of U.S. allies is at risk.

We can therefore expect additional crises, more aggressive behavior and less cooperation from allies as they assess American fecklessness. The president who wanted to rid the world of nukes is convincing Sunni monarchs and Eastern European countries that it is foolish to rely on the American nuclear umbrella. How many countries will insist on their own arsenal to protect themselves against Russia, China or Iran?

When Republicans choose their candidate for commander in chief, they'd be wise to pick someone who understood this all along — not simply when it all went haywire in 2014.

## **Weekly Standard**

### **Mudslinger in Chief**

***Harry Reid takes the low road.***

Fred Barnes

The Romney strategy is back. Not the flawed campaign plan of Mitt Romney for the 2012 election, but the effort by President Obama and Democrats to malign Romney, even before he'd become the GOP nominee, as morally unfit for the presidency.

Now the strategy is focused on Republican Senate candidates, some of them still running in contested primaries. From Democratic TV ads, we learn that Dan Sullivan in Alaska may not be "one of us," a true Alaskan. Tom Cotton in Arkansas, having worked for insurance companies, is "a politician we just can't trust." And Bill Cassidy in Louisiana sought to "cut off hurricane relief for Louisiana families."

There's a name for this strategy—the politics of personal destruction. It was successful in 2012 in transforming Romney's image into that of an uncaring, greedy corporate boss who made millions

while shutting down companies and throwing workers out of jobs. In one Obama ad, Romney was falsely blamed for the cancer death of a worker's wife.

The chief practitioner of the Romney strategy today is Senate majority leader Harry Reid, who is desperate to keep Republicans from taking control of the Senate in the November midterm elections. The ads are the handiwork of Reid's Senate Majority PAC or its sister organization, the Patriot Majority PAC.

What's striking is their emphasis on personal matters rather than major public issues like health care or the economy and their frequent inaccuracy. Cotton, for example, has never worked for an insurance company. Nor did Cassidy seek to curb disaster relief.

Reid's specialty is intruding in Republican primary races to discredit the candidate most likely to pose a strong challenge to a Democrat in the general election. He's done this before and has been quite effective.

In 2010, he intervened in the Nevada GOP primary with an ad ridiculing Sue Lowden, the Republican frontrunner to oppose his reelection. Reid succeeded. Lowden faded, and the winner of the primary, Sharron Angle, proved to be a poor candidate whom Reid easily defeated.

In 2012, he ran an ad in Missouri that touted the conservatism of Todd Akin, regarded as the weakest Republican against Democratic senator Claire McCaskill. With Reid's help, Akin won the GOP primary, then lost to McCaskill.

This year, Reid is seeking to poison the reputation of the most highly regarded Republicans in races against Democratic incumbents. His excuse for intervening is that Democrats are being "smeared" by Americans for Prosperity (AFP), a conservative group partially funded by Charles and David Koch.

There's a difference, however, between the AFP ads and Reid's. AFP's are far softer-hitting than Reid's brutal and often false attacks. AFP criticizes Democrats for voting for Obama's health care law—fair comment on an issue of national significance. Reid's ads fixate on pettier, personal concerns.

In Alaska, the Put Alaska First PAC has broadcast an ad questioning whether Dan Sullivan is a real Alaskan. Sullivan leads in primary polls to run against Democratic senator Mark Begich. The ad said Sullivan is "claiming to be one of us," but was born and raised in Ohio and owns a home in a "swanky" neighborhood outside Washington. "If elected, he won't just go to Washington, he'll go home to Washington."

What it doesn't say is critical. Sullivan, who had headed Alaska's department of natural resources and was state attorney general, resided in Washington for several years when he worked in the George W. Bush administration. He bought a home there, but kept Alaska as his permanent voting residence. All this is perfectly legal and commonplace—except in the ad. Put Alaska First is largely funded by Reid's Senate Majority PAC.

In Arkansas, Reid's attack on Cotton is even more dishonest. The ad said: "Cotton got paid handsomely working for insurance companies. . . . Now Cotton wants to end Medicare's guarantee, giving billions in profits to insurance companies." None of that is true.

Factcheck.org investigated the charges against Cotton. “There is no evidence Cotton did work for insurers,” it concluded. “His only established connection to the industry involved consulting work for the Federal Housing Administration.” “The bottom line is that the Senate Majority PAC used both false and outdated information in its attack on Cotton.”

In Louisiana, Cassidy leads the field in the Republican Senate primary. In fact, he has run ahead of Democratic senator Mary Landrieu in many polls. Reid’s PAC indulged in guilt by association in tying Cassidy to the Koch brothers, who have aired TV ads pointing out Landrieu’s support for Obamacare. The Reid ad claimed Cassidy would “fight” for the Kochs to raise flood insurance premiums. Actually, Cassidy backed the flood insurance bill the Kochs opposed.

In other cases, Senate Majority PAC ads have been merely sleazy. An ad in North Carolina showed two couples alone in dark settings and linked Thom Tillis to the sex scandal in which his chief of staff and another aide were fired. Tillis’s involvement consisted only of giving bonuses to the aides on their departure.

In New Hampshire, a Reid ad said Scott Brown, the former Massachusetts senator now running for the Senate in New Hampshire, had purportedly saved Wall Street \$19 billion in taxes. If true, he didn’t do it alone. The ad failed to mention Brown was one of the few Republicans to vote for the successful Democratic bill opposed by Wall Street, the Dodd-Frank legislation.

As reckless as Reid’s PAC ads are, they’ve attracted little attention from the mainstream media, much less prompted any indignation. Such permissiveness should worry Republicans, since it’s likely to lead Reid to continue his unscrupulous offensive.

His ads have achieved at least minimal success. The months-long fusillade by both his PACs has caused Cotton to fall narrowly behind Democratic senator Mark Pryor in recent polls. His approval rating also dipped. Fortunately, Cotton came up with an antidote last week, a witty ad featuring his Army drill sergeant.

Pryor—whose father was governor of Arkansas and served in the Senate for 18 years—had insisted Cotton felt “a sense of entitlement” to a Senate seat because of his military experience. His Army training, Cotton said in his TV spot, had taught him “accountability, humility, and putting the unit before yourself. That training stuck.” To which Master Sergeant George Norton responded, “It better have.”

## **Power Line** **Wretched Reid** by Scott Johnson

It seems to me that in Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid we have something new under the sun. He revives old-fashioned, LBJ-style corruption in office, as Adam O’Neal’s [understated RCP column suggests](#). He brings pure partisan prevarication and hackery to his office, as Fred Barnes suggests in [“Mudslinger in chief.”](#) And he disgraces the institution that he leads, as Victor Davis Hanson judges in [“A McCarthy for our time.”](#)

Liberal commentators observe Reid’s shenanigans in the spirit of detached amusement. In this respect [Chris Cillizza is representative](#). It’s the best he and they can do, but it is pathetic.

If that's the best Cillizza can do as a supposed political junkie — if the chairman of the Republican National Committee is [a truer guide](#) to the Reid phenomenon than Cillizza — it's time for him and his ilk to pursue other opportunities.

As Senate Majority Leader, Harry Reid has brought his office to an unprecedented low. There is no lie he will not recite, no libel he will resist so long as it advances some narrow partisan purpose. As Majority Leader, he holds the mirror up to President Obama. They illuminate each other. It's not a pretty sight.

If Reid had a shred of decency, he would be ashamed. But he doesn't and he isn't.





