

December 1, 2014

Heather Mac Donald in City Journal has more on the president's irresponsible comments over the violence in Ferguson.

President Obama betrayed the nation last night. Even as he went on national television to respond to the grand jury's decision not to indict Ferguson, Missouri police officer Darren Wilson for fatally shooting 18-year-old Michael Brown in August, the vicious violence that would destroy businesses and livelihoods over the next several hours was underway. Obama had one job and one job only last night: to defend the workings of the criminal-justice system and the rule of law. Instead, he turned his talk into a primer on police racism and criminal-justice bias. In so doing, he perverted his role as the leader of all Americans and as the country's most visible symbol of the primacy of the law.

Obama gestured wanly toward the need to respect the grand jury's decision and to protest peacefully. "We are a nation built on the rule of law. And so we need to accept that this decision was the grand jury's to make," he said. But his tone of voice and body language unmistakably conveyed his disagreement, if not disgust, with that decision. "There are Americans who are deeply disappointed, even angry. It's an understandable reaction," he said. Understandable, so long as one ignores the evidence presented to the grand jury. The testimony of a half-dozen black observers at the scene demolished the early incendiary reports that Wilson attacked Brown in cold blood and shot Brown in his back when his hands were up. Those early witnesses who had claimed gratuitous brutality on Wilson's part contradicted themselves and were in turn contradicted by the physical evidence and by other witnesses, who corroborated Wilson's testimony that Brown had attacked him and had tried to grab his gun. (Minutes before, the nearly 300-pound Brown had thuggishly robbed a shopkeeper of a box of cigars; Wilson had received a report of that robbery and a description of Brown before stopping him.) Obama should have briefly reiterated the grounds for not indicting Wilson and applauded the decision as the product of a scrupulously thorough and fair process. He should have praised the jurors for their service and courage in following the evidence where it led them. And he should have concluded by noting that there is no fairer criminal justice system in the world than the one we have in the United States. ...

... This misinformation about the criminal-justice system and the police will increase hatred of the police. That hatred, in turn, will heighten the chances of more Michael Browns attacking officers and getting shot themselves. Police officers in the tensest areas may back off of assertive policing. Such de-policing will leave thousands of law-abiding minority residents who fervently support the police ever more vulnerable to thugs.

Obama couldn't have stopped the violence last night with his address to the nation. But in casting his lot with those who speciously impugn our criminal-justice system, he has increased the likelihood of more such violence in the future.

Naomi Schaefer Riley writes on the lies of CNN.

Here's a quiz for you folks in the media: What happens if you're out doing "man on the street" interviews but none of the men on the street fit your "narrative"?

If you're CNN, you stop interviewing them.

It has been remarkable to watch the last few days as America's self-styled "most trusted news network" has sent out teams of reporters to various areas of Ferguson, Mo., ostensibly to cover the

protests there. While their cameramen are watching cars on fire and stores being looted, the reporters ramble on about how “most people here” are “peaceful protesters.” ...

... From day one, CNN has twisted the Ferguson story. The network decided early on that an injustice had been done, contrary facts aside. When the grand jury decided not to indict, CNN was primed for outrage, because there was no way officer Darren Wilson could have acted appropriately.

The network helped stir up a nation to the point of violence. Yet, since the protesters must always be on the side of angels, CNN lies about the destruction that follows.

It's rare you see the liberal media's dishonesty in such stark terms, but CNN can't control the pictures. If you wanted to know what was really happening this week, all you had to do was press the mute button.

Editors of the San Diego Union-Tribune mock the "team of rivals" trope.

... Hagel's defenders say the primary sin of the former Nebraska senator was to question the president's shifting strategies in dealing with the Islamic State terrorist group and the chaos in Iraq and Syria. Though he earned a reputation as a dove in the Senate, Hagel was among the first officials to warn of the seriousness of the Islamic State threat, undercutting the narrative then being offered by the White House. The first combat veteran to run the Pentagon also told former Senate colleagues that he has long felt shut out of decision-making.

Both of Hagel's predecessors as defense secretary — Robert Gates and Leon Panetta — have offered similar critiques. They said Obama listened too much to staffers with little national security experience — aides focused on short-term domestic politics and tending to the president's image.

This is utterly at odds with the narrative offered in Obama's first term. Then we were told that like Abraham Lincoln, the president had brought in a “Team of Rivals” to serve as his key advisers — able, headstrong men and women who weren't afraid to disagree with the president.

The departure of Gates and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton made that thesis seem dubious. The treatment of Hagel makes it seem absurd. ...

Kim Strassel has more on Hagel's exit.

Vice President Joe Biden lamented earlier this year that there were too many Americans stuck in a “dead-end job.” If only he had noted how many work near his office.

Of all the reputations Barack Obama has built over these years, the one that may figure most into his struggling presidency is the one that has received the least attention: He is a lousy boss. Every administration has its share of power struggles, dysfunction and churn. Rarely, if ever, has there been one that has driven more competent people from its orbit—or chewed up more professional reputations.

The focus this week is on Chuck Hagel, and the difficulty the White House is having finding the next secretary of defense. The charitable explanation is that lame-duck executives always have a challenge finding a short-termmer to mop up the end of a presidency. The more honest appraisal

came from a former Defense official who told Politico that Michèle Flournoy—a leading contender who removed herself from consideration—didn't “want to be a doormat” in an administration that likes its failed foreign policy, and is keeping it.

“Doormat” has been the job description for pretty much every Obama employee. ...

Washington Post gives us a behind the scenes look at an appearance by the Queen. When officials at the University of California at Los Angeles began negotiating a \$300,000 speech appearance by Hillary Rodham Clinton, the school had one request: Could we get a reduced rate for public universities?

The answer from Clinton's representatives: \$300,000 is the “special university rate.”

That e-mail exchange and other internal communications, obtained this week by The Washington Post under a Freedom of Information Act request, provide a rare glimpse into the complex and meticulous backstage efforts to manage the likely 2016 presidential candidate's lucrative speaking career.

At UCLA, efforts to book Clinton and then prepare for her visit were all-consuming, beginning almost immediately after she left her job as secretary of state on Feb. 1, 2013, until she delivered her Luskin Lecture for Thought Leadership speech on March 5, 2014.

The documents show that Clinton's representatives at the Harry Walker Agency exerted considerable control over her appearance and managed even the smallest details — from requesting lemon wedges and water on stage to a computer, scanner, and a spread of hummus and crudité in the green room backstage. ...

... By contract, Clinton's approval was needed for any promotional materials. Clinton gave permission for the university to record the event, but “for archival purposes only.” For public distribution, Clinton's speaking agency approved only a two-minute highlight video to upload to YouTube. “Please make sure it is available only for one (1) year from the date of posting,” a Harry Walker Agency official added.

Clinton posed for individual photos with 100 VIPS, or 50 couples — “We get a total of 50 clicks,” one university official explained — as well as two group photos. Lippert wrote to colleagues that Clinton's representatives wanted the group shots “prestaged,” with participants assembled and ready to take the photographs before Clinton arrived “so the secretary isn't waiting for these folks to get their act together.” Reiterating the request, Lippert added, “She doesn't like to stand around waiting for people.”

Like many major universities, UCLA regularly pays high-profile speakers to visit campus. Many of the visits are funded through a private endowment and not with tuition or public dollars. Clinton's appearance was privately funded as part of a lecture series endowed by Meyer Luskin, an investor and president of Scope Industries, a food waste recycling company.

In 2012, former president Bill Clinton delivered the inaugural Luskin lecture at UCLA for \$250,000. Upon learning that Hillary Clinton's fee would be \$300,000, Guy Wheatley, a UCLA development official, wrote in an e-mail: “Wow! She get's \$50K more than hubby!” ...

City Journal

Obama's Ferguson Sellout

The president's irresponsible statements will make a bad situation worse.

by Heather Mac Donald

President Obama betrayed the nation last night. Even as he went on national television to respond to the grand jury's decision not to indict Ferguson, Missouri police officer Darren Wilson for fatally shooting 18-year-old Michael Brown in August, the vicious violence that would destroy businesses and livelihoods over the next several hours was underway. Obama had one job and one job only last night: to defend the workings of the criminal-justice system and the rule of law. Instead, he turned his talk into a primer on police racism and criminal-justice bias. In so doing, he perverted his role as the leader of all Americans and as the country's most visible symbol of the primacy of the law.

Obama gestured wanly toward the need to respect the grand jury's decision and to protest peacefully. "We are a nation built on the rule of law. And so we need to accept that this decision was the grand jury's to make," he said. But his tone of voice and body language unmistakably conveyed his disagreement, if not disgust, with that decision. "There are Americans who are deeply disappointed, even angry. It's an understandable reaction," he said. Understandable, so long as one ignores the evidence presented to the grand jury. The testimony of a half-dozen black observers at the scene demolished the early incendiary reports that Wilson attacked Brown in cold blood and shot Brown in his back when his hands were up. Those early witnesses who had claimed gratuitous brutality on Wilson's part contradicted themselves and were in turn contradicted by the physical evidence and by other witnesses, who corroborated Wilson's testimony that Brown had attacked him and had tried to grab his gun. (Minutes before, the nearly 300-pound Brown had thuggishly robbed a shopkeeper of a box of cigars; Wilson had received a report of that robbery and a description of Brown before stopping him.) Obama should have briefly reiterated the grounds for not indicting Wilson and applauded the decision as the product of a scrupulously thorough and fair process. He should have praised the jurors for their service and courage in following the evidence where it led them. And he should have concluded by noting that there is no fairer criminal justice system in the world than the one we have in the United States.

Instead, Obama reprimanded local police officers in advance for their presumed overreaction to the protests: "I also appeal to the law enforcement officials in Ferguson and the region to show care and restraint in managing peaceful protests that may occur. . . . They need to work with the community, not against the community, to distinguish the handful of people who may use the grand jury's decision as an excuse for violence . . . from the vast majority who just want their voices heard around legitimate issues in terms of how communities and law enforcement interact." Such skepticism about the ability of the police to maintain the peace appropriately was unwarranted at the time and even more so in retrospect; the forces of law and order didn't fire a single shot last night. Nor did they inflict injury, despite having been fired at themselves. Missouri governor Jay Nixon has been under attack for days for having authorized a potential mobilization of the National Guard—as if the August rioting didn't more than justify such a precaution. Any small business owner facing another wave of violence would have been desperate for such protection and more. Though Nixon didn't actually call up the Guard last night, his prophylactic declaration of a state of emergency proved prescient.

Obama left no doubt that he believed the narrative of the mainstream media and race activists about Ferguson. That narrative held that the shooting of Brown was a symbol of nationwide police misbehavior and that the August riots were an “understandable” reaction to widespread societal injustice. “The situation in Ferguson speaks to broader challenges that we still face as a nation. The fact is in too many parts of this country a deep distrust exists between law enforcement and communities of color.” This distrust is justified, in Obama’s view. He reinvoked the “diversity” bromide about the racial composition of police forces, implying that white officers cannot fairly police black communities. In fact, some of the [most criticized law-enforcement bodies](#) in recent years have been majority black.

“We have made enormous progress in race relations,” Obama conceded. “But what is also true is that there are still problems and communities of color aren’t just making these problems up. . . . The law too often feels like it’s being applied in a discriminatory fashion . . . these are real issues. And we have to lift them up and not deny them or try to tamp them down.” To claim that the laws are applied in a discriminatory fashion is a calumny, [unsupported by evidence](#). For the president of the United States to put his imprimatur on such propaganda is bad enough; to do so following a verdict in so incendiary a case is grossly irresponsible. But such partiality follows the pattern of this administration in Ferguson and elsewhere, with Attorney General Eric Holder prematurely declaring the Ferguson police force in need of wholesale change and President Obama [invoking Ferguson at the United Nations](#) as a manifestation of America’s ethnic strife.

Last night’s wanton destruction was over-determined. For weeks, the press has been salivating at the potential for black violence. The *New York Times* has been running [several stories](#) a day, most on the front page, about such a prospect, building on its series earlier in the fall about racism in Ferguson. Press coverage of racial tension treats black violence as both expected and normal. By now, riots are regarded [as virtually a black entitlement](#).

The press [is dusting off hoary tropes](#) about police stops and racism. Clearly we are reentering a period of heightened anti-law enforcement agitation, recalling the racial profiling crusade of the 1990s. The *New York Times*’s fall series selected various features of Ferguson almost at random and declared them racist, simply by virtue of their being associated with the city. A similar conceit has already emerged regarding the now-concluded grand jury investigation: innocent or admirable features of the prosecutor’s management of the case, such as the thoroughness of the evidence presented, are now blasted as the product of a flawed or deliberately tainted process, so desperate are the activists to discredit the grand jury’s decision.

This misinformation about the criminal-justice system and the police will increase hatred of the police. That hatred, in turn, will heighten the chances of more Michael Browns attacking officers and getting shot themselves. Police officers in the tensest areas may back off of assertive policing. Such de-policing will leave thousands of law-abiding minority residents who fervently support the police ever more vulnerable to thugs.

Obama couldn’t have stopped the violence last night with his address to the nation. But in casting his lot with those who speciously impugn our criminal-justice system, he has increased the likelihood of more such violence in the future.

NY Post

[CNN is lying when they say Ferguson protests were 'peaceful'](#)

by Naomi Schaefer Riley

Here's a quiz for you folks in the media: What happens if you're out doing "man on the street" interviews but none of the men on the street fit your "narrative"?

If you're CNN, you stop interviewing them.

It has been remarkable to watch the last few days as America's self-styled "most trusted news network" has sent out teams of reporters to various areas of [Ferguson, Mo.](#), ostensibly to cover the protests there. While their cameramen are watching cars on fire and stores being looted, the reporters ramble on about how "most people here" are "peaceful protesters."



Protesters burn down a clothing boutique on West Florissant Avenue in Ferguson Tuesday, November 25th.

Where are these peaceful protesters? The reporters can't seem to find any. Instead, they turn to outside experts and some carefully vetted religious leaders to talk about "the real message" of the protests.



A fire bomb is thrown on top of a police car in Ferguson.

On Tuesday night, CNN correspondent Jason Carroll was reporting, “Most of the protesting we saw in front of the Ferguson Police Department tonight was peaceful.” Then as he started trying to explain the fires burning behind him, he was approached by three of the protesters, who proceeded to get in his face and yell at him because he was promoting a “certain narrative” — the police narrative. “You don’t understand!” one screamed.

Anchor Don Lemon quickly went elsewhere, saying he was worried about Carroll’s safety. When Lemon returned to Carroll later in the broadcast and asked him what the men were saying to him, Carroll refused to say. The reporter was stonewalling because, he explained, these men didn’t “represent” the peaceful protesters who were really the story.

CNN’s “narrative” was laid out early on Monday evening as correspondent Van Jones (formerly of the Obama administration) warned the audience not to pay attention to “a few knuckleheads” who later became a “bunch of knuckleheads” who “started a bunch of nonsense.”

Knuckleheads? Nonsense? When did knucklehead become a synonym for arsonist? When did taking a baseball bat to store windows become “a bunch of nonsense?” Talk about defining deviancy down.

On Tuesday night, Lemon even asked Jones about the difficulty they were having in finding peaceful protesters to interview, and Jones replied that “a lot of these young people are on the knife’s edge between violence and nonviolence.” What does that even mean?

Lemon did not ask. Instead, he returned to Marc Lamont Hill, who explained that the problem is not the protesters but the police who have been “disingenuous” by closing off a road to protesters after they heard shots being fired.

Again, he notes that the protesters were very peaceful — and would have remained so if it weren’t for those police officers making people so angry by stifling their voices.

This is a news organization that has lost all sense of its role.

There was even a debate among these knuckleheads — sorry, correspondents — over whether they should have aired video of Michael Brown’s stepfather standing on top of a car yelling, “Burn this bitch down,” right after the verdict was released.



Vehicles burn at a car dealership during riots in Ferguson.

When the Brown family called for peaceful protest, that was reported, but this outburst may not have been newsworthy, according to some of the CNN experts.

Come on. Enough is enough. These were not peaceful protests from the beginning.

Civil disobedience does not happen at night. No matter when the grand jury decision was announced, people who are engaged in peaceful protest take out their signs and march down the street in broad daylight.



A local business the morning after the grand jury delivered their decision.

Peaceful protesters don't wear creepy anarchist masks or even bandannas to cover their faces. They are protesting with a clear conscience and are happy to have anyone know their identity.

Peaceful protesters do not dress like they are about to knock over a convenience store because they are not about to knock over a convenience store.

From day one, CNN has twisted the Ferguson story. The network decided early on that an injustice had been done, contrary facts aside. When the grand jury decided not to indict, CNN was primed for outrage, because there was no way officer Darren Wilson could have acted appropriately.

The network helped stir up a nation to the point of violence. Yet, since the protesters must always be on the side of angels, CNN lies about the destruction that follows.

It's rare you see the liberal media's dishonesty in such stark terms, but CNN can't control the pictures. If you wanted to know what was really happening this week, all you had to do was press the mute button.

San Diego Union-Tribune - Editorial **'Team of Rivals'? More like team of yes men**

The importance of presidents having blunt people in their inner circles, willing to tell them things they don't want to hear, can scarcely be exaggerated. The two recent former presidents who fare best both among historians and in public surveys had such candid figures around them. Ronald Reagan benefitted massively from the counsel of James A. Baker III, known as the "Velvet Hammer," who served him as chief of staff and treasury secretary. Bill Clinton's vice president, Al Gore, once snarled "Get with the god---- program" at him, annoyed by Clinton's waffling in budget negotiations. After Democrats were wiped out in the 1994 midterm elections, Clinton asked a Republican consultant, Dick Morris, to tell him where he had gone wrong — then changed course on some big issues.

The contrast with President Barack Obama is telling. Instead of seeking blunt assessments in the wake of Democrats' midterm wipeout on Nov. 4, the president has now orchestrated the resignation of someone actually willing to tell the White House it was making mistakes: Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel.

The president's aides depict Hagel as a poor advocate and defender of administration policies and cite his lackluster news conferences and congressional testimony.

But Hagel's defenders say the primary sin of the former Nebraska senator was to question the president's shifting strategies in dealing with the Islamic State terrorist group and the chaos in Iraq and Syria. Though he earned a reputation as a dove in the Senate, Hagel was among the first officials to warn of the seriousness of the Islamic State threat, undercutting the narrative then being offered by the White House. The first combat veteran to run the Pentagon also told former Senate colleagues that he has long felt shut out of decision-making.

Both of Hagel's predecessors as defense secretary — Robert Gates and Leon Panetta — have offered similar critiques. They said Obama listened too much to staffers with little national security experience — aides focused on short-term domestic politics and tending to the president's image.

This is utterly at odds with the narrative offered in Obama's first term. Then we were told that like Abraham Lincoln, the president had brought in a "Team of Rivals" to serve as his key advisers — able, headstrong men and women who weren't afraid to disagree with the president.

The departure of Gates and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton made that thesis seem dubious. The treatment of Hagel makes it seem absurd.

These are dangerous times for America, only starting with the threats posed by Islamic State and Russian provocateur Vladimir Putin. We need a strong, experienced national security team taking a long view of our policies and interests. President Obama appears to have such a team. Unfortunately, their views often appear to be valued less than those of political operatives with far more access to the Oval Office.

But don't take our word for it. Listen to the three distinguished Americans the president has asked to serve as secretary of defense.

WSJ

Obama's 'Horrible Bosses 3' Audition

The president's playbook when things go wrong: Deny knowledge, blame hapless subordinates.

by Kimberley Strassel

Vice President [Joe Biden](#) lamented earlier this year that there were too many Americans stuck in a "dead-end job." If only he had noted how many work near his office.

Of all the reputations [Barack Obama](#) has built over these years, the one that may figure most into his struggling presidency is the one that has received the least attention: He is a lousy boss. Every administration has its share of power struggles, dysfunction and churn. Rarely, if ever, has there been one that has driven more competent people from its orbit—or chewed up more professional reputations.

The focus this week is on Chuck Hagel, and the difficulty the White House is having finding the next secretary of defense. The charitable explanation is that lame-duck executives always have a challenge finding a short-termer to mop up the end of a presidency. The more honest appraisal came from a former Defense official who told Politico that Michèle Flournoy—a leading contender who removed herself from consideration—didn't "want to be a doormat" in an administration that likes its failed foreign policy, and is keeping it.

"Doormat" has been the job description for pretty much every Obama employee. The president bragged in 2008 that he would assemble in his cabinet a "Team of Rivals." What he failed to explain to any of the poor saps is that they'd be window dressing for a Team of Select Brilliant Political Types Who Already Had All the Answers: namely, himself and the Valerie Jarretts and David Axelrods of the White House.

These days, what able-minded Democrat would want to work for a boss who asks hires to check their brains at the door and then read from the talking points? Respected economist Christina Romer came in as Mr. Obama's first head of his Council of Economic Advisers; she left after 18 months, tired of putting out imaginary numbers in support of the stimulus. Former Marine

Commandant Jim Jones lasted about the same duration as national security adviser, until he wearied of saluting the political gurus.

The experienced Bill Daley came in 2011 as the chief of staff tasked with repairing Mr. Obama's relations with the business community. He left a year later, having been stripped of many duties and trashed by the White House to the press. The sage [Leon Panetta](#) stepped up as defense secretary in 2011; he too left after 20 months of getting his head patted. The folks who look smartest now are those who fled early, while the fleeing was still relatively good—Rahm Emanuel, Austan Goolsbee, Larry Summers, Peter Orszag, Vivek Kundra.

Who would want to work for a boss who micromanages everything but takes no responsibility when things don't work out? This president's playbook for controversy: Deny knowledge, blame subordinates. Mr. Obama fails to recognize the threat of ISIS; it's the fault of Director of National Intelligence James Clapper. The administration cancels White House tours to ratchet up the pain of the sequester, then blames the Secret Service for the uproar. The ObamaCare website fails; Mr. Obama faults the Department of Health and Human Services (run then by [Kathleen Sebelius](#)) for not telling him of the problem. Veterans Affairs wilts under the scandal of waiting lists; the president claims he read about it in the news.

Who would want to work for a boss whose experiments in big government all but guarantee their reputation will be ruined in the aftermath of a bureaucratic collapse? Ms. Sebelius was once the governor of Kansas. She will be remembered as the woman who oversaw the most disastrous government rollout in history. Steven Miller will always be the guy who was running the IRS when the targeting scandal broke. Eric Shinseki was awarded three bronze stars and two purple hearts in Vietnam. He'll be remembered for the waiting list coverup at Veterans Affairs, an agency that is the model for ObamaCare.

And who wants to work for a boss who doesn't have your back? In addition to the above, don't forget [David Petraeus](#), whose softening up at the hands of Mr. Obama's antiwar left made his continued brief tenure as CIA director unthinkable in the wake of revelations of an extramarital affair. Or Keith Alexander, the former National Security Agency director, who was left alone to defend against the outrage over Mr. Obama's surveillance policies. As Mr. Hagel was kicked to the curb this week, an anonymous White House campaign heaped the administration's foreign-policy failures on the departing Republican.

Not that Ms. Sebelius or Mr. Shinseki and others didn't deserve to have to resign; they oversaw disasters. The question so many potential nominees have about working for this White House goes to that very point: Is it possible to have any other experience working for Mr. Obama—a boss who doesn't listen, views everything politically, always thinks he's right, and whose policies are a recipe for a lost reputation? Hey Washington: Don't all put your hands up at once.

Washington Post

[Plans for UCLA visit give rare glimpse into Hillary Clinton's paid speaking career](#)

by Rosalind S. Helderman and Philip Rucker

When officials at the University of California at Los Angeles began negotiating a \$300,000 speech appearance by Hillary Rodham Clinton, the school had one request: Could we get a reduced rate for public universities?

The answer from Clinton's representatives: \$300,000 is the "special university rate."

That e-mail exchange and other internal communications, obtained this week by The Washington Post under a Freedom of Information Act request, provide a rare glimpse into the complex and meticulous backstage efforts to manage the likely 2016 presidential candidate's [lucrative speaking career](#).

At UCLA, efforts to book Clinton and then prepare for her visit were all-consuming, beginning almost immediately after she left her job as secretary of state on Feb. 1, 2013, until she delivered her [Luskin Lecture for Thought Leadership](#) speech on March 5, 2014.

The documents show that Clinton's representatives at the Harry Walker Agency exerted considerable control over her appearance and managed even the smallest details — from requesting lemon wedges and water on stage to a computer, scanner, and a spread of hummus and crudité in the green room backstage.

Top university officials discussed at length the style and color of the executive armchairs Clinton and moderator [Lynn Vavreck](#) would sit in as they carried on a question-and-answer session, as well as the kind of pillows to be situated on each chair. Clinton's representatives requested that the chairs be outfitted with two long, rectangular pillows — and that two cushions be kept backstage in case the chair was too deep and she needed additional back support.

After a lengthy call with a Clinton representative, UCLA administrator Patricia Lippert reported to campus colleagues, "She uses a lavalier [microphone] and will both speak from the audience and walk around stage, TED talk style. We need a teleprompter and 2-3 downstage scrolling monitors [for] her to read from."

During a walk-through of Royce Hall five days before the lecture, the e-mails show, Clinton's team rejected the podium planned for her use during her 20- to 30-minute speech, setting off a scramble on campus to find a suitable podium and rent a new university seal to match.

In the nearly two years since stepping down as secretary of state, Clinton has made [dozens of paid appearances](#) across the country at industry conventions and Wall Street banks as well as at universities. Her [UCLA fee](#), like those at other universities, went to the Bill, Hillary & Chelsea Clinton Foundation, the family's nonprofit group.

But critics have argued that the carefully staged events and high speaking fees could complicate Clinton's ability to run a populist campaign built around the economic struggles of the middle class.

Versions of Clinton's standard speaking contracts have surfaced publicly this year — including her [luxury travel requirements](#) — but the contracts do not contain the extensive detail seen in the UCLA communications.

It is unclear how personally involved Clinton was in the UCLA negotiations and whether the requests from her agency were being directed by her or merely from underlings anticipating her preferences.

A Clinton spokesman declined to comment on the speaking arrangements.

It is commonplace for celebrity speakers to request special accommodations — and Clinton was no exception. Her representatives asked for a case of still water, room temperature, to be deposited stage right. They also asked that "a carafe of warm/hot water, coffee cup and saucer,

pitcher of room temperature water, water glass, and lemon wedges” be situated both on a table on stage as well as in another room where Clinton would stand for photos with VIPs.

For the green room, Clinton’s representatives requested: “Coffee, tea, room temp sparkling and still water, diet ginger ale, crudité, hummus and sliced fruit.” They also asked for a computer, mouse and printer, as well as a scanner, which the university had to purchase for the occasion.

When university officials decided to award Clinton the UCLA Medal, Clinton’s team asked that it be presented to her in a box rather than draped around her neck. That request was sent to the university’s chancellor, Gene Block.

“Chancellor Block has agreed to accommodate Hillary Clinton’s request to have the medal presented in a box,” Assistant Provost Margaret Leal-Sotelo wrote in one e-mail.

Lippert replied: “I can either have the jewelers box open or closed, in case the Chancellor doesn’t want to risk opening it.”

By contract, Clinton’s approval was needed for any promotional materials. Clinton gave permission for the university to record the event, but “for archival purposes only.” For public distribution, Clinton’s speaking agency approved only a two-minute highlight video to upload to YouTube. “Please make sure it is available only for one (1) year from the date of posting,” a Harry Walker Agency official added.

Clinton posed for individual photos with 100 VIPs, or 50 couples — “We get a total of 50 clicks,” one university official explained — as well as two group photos. Lippert wrote to colleagues that Clinton’s representatives wanted the group shots “prestaged,” with participants assembled and ready to take the photographs before Clinton arrived “so the secretary isn’t waiting for these folks to get their act together.” Reiterating the request, Lippert added, “She doesn’t like to stand around waiting for people.”

Like many major universities, UCLA regularly pays high-profile speakers to visit campus. Many of the visits are funded through a private endowment and not with tuition or public dollars. Clinton’s appearance was privately funded as part of a lecture series endowed by Meyer Luskin, an investor and president of Scope Industries, a food waste recycling company.

In 2012, former president Bill Clinton delivered the inaugural Luskin lecture at UCLA for \$250,000. Upon learning that Hillary Clinton’s fee would be \$300,000, Guy Wheatley, a UCLA development official, wrote in an e-mail: “Wow! She get’s \$50K more than hubby!”

Luskin told a university official to make sure the event raised at least \$100,000. The university sold more tickets — which ranged in price from \$250 for one seat to \$2,000 for two seats, a photo with Clinton and access to a post-lecture reception with the college deans — and provided fewer free tickets to students.

UCLA Communications Director Jean-Paul Renaud said in a statement that Clinton’s speech helped “expand dialogue among scholars, leaders in government and business, and the greater Los Angeles community.” He said that the university acted “as a responsible steward of financial resources” and that ticket revenue funded the College’s Greatest Needs Fund, which includes undergraduate and graduate student support.

On campus, university planners fielded repeated requests for complimentary or reserved tickets — for scholarship students, for donors, for faculty and staff.

Organizers faced criticism that more students could not attend, particularly after an early morning event to allow students to enter a lottery for one of 413 free tickets turned into a shoving match. But students without tickets were able to watch a live stream of the event in an overflow location, Renaud said.

Other controversy surrounded Clinton's visit. When an online survey asked the public what questions should be posed during a 40-minute question-and-answer session, university officials noted in e-mails that the majority of the suggestions were about the 2012 terrorist attacks in Benghazi, Libya.

Days after the lecture, administrators discussed an e-mail that had arrived from graduate Charles McKenna, a lawyer who said he was concerned that the university was charging more than \$250 for a ticket to hear a public official speak.

"In effect, this is a campaign appearance, as Ms. Clinton is undeniably looking into a presidential run in 2016," McKenna wrote. "Why is a public university charging the public for the pleasure of providing Ms. Clinton the benefit of a high profile platform?"

One UCLA official advised against responding to McKenna's e-mail "unless he pushes." Another UCLA official then looked up the man's giving record and responded that while he was a donor, he had not given large amounts.

In an interview Wednesday, McKenna said he never received a response to his e-mail. "If you're a big shot, you get attention," he said. "I'm not a big shot, by any stretch of the imagination."

Rosalind Helderman is a political enterprise and investigations reporter for the Washington Post.



CATALINO
COPYRIGHT 2014
CREATORS.COM

I HEARD WHAT
AMERICA WANTS.

THEN WHY ARE
YOU STILL IN
OFFICE?



