

April 7, 2015

Matthew Continetti has doubts about the Iran agreement since the president and his minions have shown themselves to be serial liars.

President Obama strode to the lectern in the Rose Garden Thursday to announce a “historic” agreement between the United States and the Islamic Republic of Iran. The preliminary deal made in Lausanne, Switzerland, the president said, “cuts off every pathway Iran could take to develop a nuclear weapon.” I hope he’s right.

But I’m not counting on it. The president has a terrible record of initial public pronouncements on national security. He has a habit of confidently stating things that turn out not to be true. Three times in the last four years he has appeared in the Rose Garden and made assertions that were later proven to be false. He and his national security team have again and again described a world that does not correspond to reality. No reason to assume these concessions to Iran will be any different.

The U.S. consulate in Benghazi, Libya, was attacked on September 11, 2012. Four Americans were killed, including our ambassador. Obama delivered remarks on the attack in the Rose Garden the following day. “No acts of terror will ever shake the resolve of this great nation,” he said. What he didn’t say was that the killings in Benghazi specifically were a “terrorist attack” or “terrorism.” On 60 Minutes, when asked if he believed Benghazi was a “terrorist attack,” the president replied, “It’s too early to know how this came about.” On September 14, neither the president nor Secretary of State Hillary Clinton called what had happened a terrorist attack. On September 15, Obama referred to Benghazi as a “tragic attack.” On September 16, Susan Rice, then U.N. ambassador, called it a “spontaneous attack.”

By September 24, when Obama recorded a campaign interview with The View, he again refused to say Benghazi was an attack by terrorists. “We’re still doing an investigation,” he told Joy Behar. It was not until two days later that administration officials began referring to Benghazi as a terrorist attack—something the Libyan government had been saying since September 13.

The story originally put out by the White House, that Benghazi was the result of spontaneous anger at an Internet video offensive to Muslim extremists, fell apart in a matter of days. Yet the White House persisted in its false description of reality, declining to confirm what was widely accepted as a premeditated terrorist assault on a U.S. compound, and chose to ascribe responsibility for the events in question to anti-Islamic bias. The evidence continues to mount that Ansar al-Sharia, the Qaeda affiliate in lawless Libya, was behind the events of September 11, 2012, not the stupid video. ...

David Harsanyi writes on the false choice presented to the country.
“It’s either this or war.”

War?! Well, jeez, if those are our choices everyone better get on board, pronto.

According to Politico, this false choice is the central political argument the White House plans to use to convince members of Congress, voters, and allies that capitulation to Iran is the best course of action. It’s not surprising since that’s been the standard rhetorical ammo used by Left since Iranian negotiations began. If you’re not as anxious as others to help an apocalyptic,

terror-funded, destabilizing regime reach the threshold of nuclear weapons, you, my friend, are the warmonger.

So what happens if the “framework for an understanding of a potential agreement” falls apart? The Iranians are, after all, notoriously unreliable in negotiations, with a long history of lying about their intentions and breaking agreements. How soon will Obama, who can barely get himself to say an unkind word about the Iranian regime, deploy ground troops to take care of business? Maybe someone will ask him.

As a political matter, this Obama standby—my economic plan or ruin, my climate plan or Armageddon, my health-care plan or death—makes the very act of coming to any “deal” palatable because the alternative is unfathomable. It’s also an easy way smear the enemies of peace—Israel and Congress, in this case—and dismiss any legitimate concerns they have regarding security as inconsequential because no matter how bad this deal looks, the imaginary consequences of not doing it are far worse.

“This is very complicated. A lot of this is hard to talk about to the American people,” one senior administration told Politico. “This is tough stuff to put your mind around.” So they will simplify it for you. ...

Judith Miller penned an interesting WSJ OpEd on the Iraq War and "stubborn myths."

I took America to war in Iraq. It was all me.

OK, I had some help from a duplicitous vice president, Dick Cheney. Then there was George W. Bush, a gullible president who could barely locate Iraq on a map and who wanted to avenge his father and enrich his friends in the oil business. And don’t forget the neoconservatives in the White House and the Pentagon who fed cherry-picked intelligence about Iraq’s weapons of mass destruction, or WMD, to reporters like me.

None of these assertions happens to be true, though all were published and continue to have believers. This is not how wars come about, and it is surely not how the war in Iraq occurred. Nor is it what I did as a reporter for the New York Times. These false narratives deserve, at last, to be retired.

There was no shortage of mistakes about Iraq, and I made my share of them. The newsworthy claims of some of my prewar WMD stories were wrong. But so is the enduring, pernicious accusation that the Bush administration fabricated WMD intelligence to take the country to war. Before the 2003 invasion, President Bush and other senior officials cited the intelligence community’s incorrect conclusions about Saddam’s WMD capabilities and, on occasion, went beyond them. But relying on the mistakes of others and errors of judgment are not the same as lying.

I have never met George W. Bush. I never discussed the war with Dick Cheney until the winter of 2012, years after he had left office and I had left the Times. I wish I could have interviewed senior officials before the war about the role that WMDs played in the decision to invade Iraq. The White House’s passion for secrecy and aversion to the media made that unlikely. Less senior officials were of help as sources, but they didn’t make the decisions.

No senior official spoon-fed me a line about WMD. That would have been so much easier than uncovering classified information that officials can be jailed for disclosing. My sources were the same counterterrorism, arms-control and Middle East analysts on whom I had relied for my stories about Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda's growing threat to America—a series published eight months before 9/11 for which the Times staff, including me, won a Pulitzer. ...

Paul Campos, law prof from Boulder, writes on the real reason college tuition is so high.

ONCE upon a time in America, baby boomers paid for college with the money they made from their summer jobs. Then, over the course of the next few decades, public funding for higher education was slashed. These radical cuts forced universities to raise tuition year after year, which in turn forced the millennial generation to take on crushing educational debt loads, and everyone lived unhappily ever after.

This is the story college administrators like to tell when they're asked to explain why, over the past 35 years, college tuition at public universities has nearly quadrupled, to \$9,139 in 2014 dollars. It is a fairy tale in the worst sense, in that it is not merely false, but rather almost the inverse of the truth.

The conventional wisdom was reflected in a recent National Public Radio series on the cost of college. "So it's not that colleges are spending more money to educate students," Sandy Baum of the Urban Institute told NPR. "It's that they have to get that money from someplace to replace their lost state funding — and that's from tuition and fees from students and families."

In fact, public investment in higher education in America is vastly larger today, in inflation-adjusted dollars, than it was during the supposed golden age of public funding in the 1960s. Such spending has increased at a much faster rate than government spending in general. For example, the military's budget is about 1.8 times higher today than it was in 1960, while legislative appropriations to higher education are more than 10 times higher. ...

... By contrast, a major factor driving increasing costs is the constant expansion of university administration. According to the Department of Education data, administrative positions at colleges and universities grew by 60 percent between 1993 and 2009, which Bloomberg reported was 10 times the rate of growth of tenured faculty positions.

Even more strikingly, an analysis by a professor at California Polytechnic University, Pomona, found that, while the total number of full-time faculty members in the C.S.U. system grew from 11,614 to 12,019 between 1975 and 2008, the total number of administrators grew from 3,800 to 12,183 — a 221 percent increase. ...

NY Post OpEd on the "Kennedy Whitewash."

... On the occasion of the opening of an "Edward M. Kennedy Institute" in Boston, "CBS Evening News" anchor Scott Pelley oozed, "Another New England superstar was honored today.

Politics was his game, and we'll have his story next." There was not one discouraging word — not even the word "liberal" — applied to arguably the single most left-wing senator of all time.

This is not a bipartisan practice. When President George W. Bush dedicated his library on April 25, 2013, CBS reporter Jim Axelrod insisted that “this library is an intellectual fortress defending one of the most controversial modern presidents, whose time in office saw the [9/11] attack on the US, two wars and the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression.”

The whitewash was so complete that even “Fox News Sunday” host Chris Wallace barked up the carnival: “Up next, our Power Player of the Week: Vicki Kennedy, on her husband’s vision to inspire new generations about the US Senate.”

Wallace noted that Teddy was fiercely partisan, and the second Mrs. Kennedy replied, “He was the proudest Democrat that there was, but the great thing about Teddy was that he always listened to the other side and worked so well with the other side.”

Except he didn’t.

Let us recall his vicious “Robert Bork’s America” speech in 1987, when he stated, “Robert Bork’s America is a land in which women would be forced into back-alley abortions, blacks would sit at segregated lunch counters, rogue police could break down citizens’ doors in midnight raids, schoolchildren could not be taught about evolution, writers and artists would be censored at the whim of government.” ...

Free Beacon

Benghazi, Bergdahl, and the Bomb

President Obama’s stories haven’t held up before. How is the Iran deal any different?

by Matthew Continetti

President Obama strode to the lectern in the Rose Garden Thursday to announce a “[historic](#)” agreement between the United States and the Islamic Republic of Iran. The [preliminary deal](#) made in Lausanne, Switzerland, the president said, “[cuts off every pathway Iran could take to develop a nuclear weapon](#).” I hope he’s right.

But I’m not counting on it. The president has a terrible record of initial public pronouncements on national security. He has a habit of confidently stating things that turn out not to be true. Three times in the last four years he has appeared in the Rose Garden and made assertions that were later proven to be false. He and his national security team have again and again described a world that does not correspond to reality. No reason to assume these concessions to Iran will be any different.

The U.S. consulate in Benghazi, Libya, was attacked on September 11, 2012. Four Americans were killed, including our ambassador. Obama delivered remarks on the attack in the Rose Garden the following day. “No acts of terror will ever shake the resolve of this great nation,” [he said](#). What he didn’t say was that the killings in Benghazi specifically were a “terrorist attack” or “terrorism.” On *60 Minutes*, [when asked if he believed Benghazi was a “terrorist attack,”](#) the president replied, “It’s too early to know how this came about.” On September 14, neither the president nor Secretary of State Hillary Clinton called what had happened a terrorist attack. On

September 15, Obama referred to Benghazi as a “tragic attack.” On September 16, Susan Rice, then U.N. ambassador, called it a “spontaneous attack.”

By September 24, when Obama recorded a campaign interview with *The View*, he again refused to say Benghazi was an attack by terrorists. “We’re still doing an investigation,” he told Joy Behar. It was not until two days later that administration officials began referring to Benghazi as a terrorist attack—something the Libyan government had been saying since September 13.

The story originally put out by the White House, that Benghazi was the result of spontaneous anger at an Internet video offensive to Muslim extremists, fell apart in a matter of days. Yet the White House persisted in its false description of reality, declining to confirm what was widely accepted as a premeditated terrorist assault on a U.S. compound, and chose to ascribe responsibility for the events in question to anti-Islamic bias. The [evidence continues to mount](#) that Ansar al-Sharia, the Qaeda affiliate in lawless Libya, was behind the events of September 11, 2012, not the stupid video.

In August 2013 President Obama announced in the Rose Garden that Syrian dictator Bashar Assad had crossed the “red line” by gassing his own people. “Now, after careful deliberation, I have decided that the United States should take military action against Syrian regime targets,” the president said. Then he punted the issue to Congress. But no action against Syrian regime targets was ever taken, because the president reversed himself and accepted a Russian proposal to ship Assad’s WMD out of Syria. “This initiative has the potential to remove the threat of chemical weapons without the use of force, particularly because Russia is one of Assad’s strongest allies,” [Obama said in a September 10, 2013, televised address](#). Almost two years later, [Assad is dropping barrel bombs filled with chlorine gas on civilians](#). Success.

Last May, President Obama [again walked purposefully to a lectern in the Rose Garden](#), and informed the world that he had released five Taliban commanders from Guantanamo Bay in exchange for Sergeant Bowe Bergdahl, who had been held prisoner by the Islamic militia for almost half a decade. “Right now,” the president said, “our top priority is making sure that Bowe gets the care and support that he needs and that he can be reunited with his family as soon as possible.”

Criticism of the prisoner swap was immediate, and intensified [when Bergdahl’s platoon-mates said he had deserted his post](#). The White House, as usual, struck back against the critics and repeated its story. On June 2, Susan Rice, now national security adviser, went on *This Week* with George Stephanopoulos and said Bergdahl “[served the United States with honor and distinction](#).”

The Government Accountability Office concluded that the Obama administration’s actions [were illegal](#). Bergdahl himself was kept isolated as the Army reviewed the circumstances of his capture by the enemy. Completed in the fall of 2014, the report by Brigadier General Kenneth Dahl still [has not been released to the public](#).

Last week, however, the Army charged Bergdahl [with desertion and misbehavior before the enemy](#). Has the White House reevaluated its trade? Of course not. On the contrary: Pentagon officials suggested on background that Bergdahl wasn’t a deserter, [he was a whistleblower!](#)

Three stories that collapsed under the weight of the evidence, three instances of the White House doggedly sticking to its policy line despite everything. This president’s resistance to events in the actual world of space and time is more than ideology, however. It’s also good

politics: By refusing to concede the facts of the case, Obama is able to hold his base and stay on offense against his true adversaries: Republicans, conservatives, and Bibi Netanyahu.

And now we have the Iran story. Iran, the president says, will reduce its centrifuges, dilute its enriched uranium, open its nuclear sites to inspectors, and turn its fortified underground reactor into a “research” facility in exchange for sanctions relief. The only alternatives, Obama goes on, are bombing Iran or ending negotiations and re-imposing sanctions. “If, in fact, Prime Minister Netanyahu is looking for the most effective way to ensure Iran doesn’t get a nuclear weapon, this is the best option. And I believe our nuclear experts can confirm that.”

Sure they can. Though I believe other nuclear experts, [such as Charles Duelfer](#), can also confirm that this agreement has major holes, such as the spotty effectiveness of inspections and the failure to get Iran to disclose fully the possible military dimensions of its nuclear program. And there’s always the tricky issue of sanctions relief: The United States says the process of lifting sanctions will be gradual and contingent on Iranian compliance, but Iranian foreign minister Javad Zarif says it will [be immediate](#).

What the president and Secretary of State John Kerry unveiled Thursday was another fancy, another fairy-tale, another fable about what might happen in an ideal world where enemies and allies share common interests and objectives, autocratic and theocratic regimes adhere to compacts, and moral sincerity is more important than results. Best be skeptical—these so-called triumphs of Obama’s diplomacy have a way of falling to pieces like ancient parchment. And keep in mind this rule: When the president enters the Rose Garden, run for cover.

The Federalist

[Obama’s False Choice Iran Lie: It’s My Way, Or War!](#)

by David Harsanyi

“It’s either this or war.”

War?! Well, jeez, if those are our choices everyone better get on board, pronto.

[According to Politico](#), this false choice is the central political argument the White House plans to use to convince members of Congress, voters, and allies that capitulation to Iran is the best course of action. It’s not surprising since that’s been the standard rhetorical ammo used by Left since Iranian negotiations began. If you’re not as anxious as others to help an apocalyptic, terror-funded, destabilizing regime reach the threshold of nuclear weapons, you, my friend, are the warmonger.

So what happens if the “[framework for an understanding of a potential agreement](#)” falls apart? The Iranians are, after all, notoriously unreliable in negotiations, with a long history of lying about their intentions and breaking agreements. How soon will Obama, who can barely get himself to say an unkind word about the Iranian regime, deploy ground troops to take care of business? Maybe someone will ask him.

As a political matter, this Obama standby—my economic plan or [ruin](#), my climate plan or [Armageddon](#), my health-care plan or [death](#)—makes the very act of coming to any “deal” palatable because the alternative is unfathomable. It’s also an easy way smear the enemies of peace—Israel and Congress, in this case—and dismiss any legitimate concerns they have

regarding security as inconsequential because no matter how bad this deal looks, the imaginary consequences of not doing it are far worse.

“This is very complicated. A lot of this is hard to talk about to the American people,” one senior administration told Politico. “This is tough stuff to put your mind around.” So they will simplify it for you.

Iran will have its enriched uranium and it will be on the threshold of becoming a nuclear state. It will not get rid of its centrifuges. This isn’t really argued anymore. Iran will get sanctions relief in exchange for inspection enforcement that depends on international organizations like the IAEA, who have [already told us](#) that the Iranians manipulate and lie about their enrichment program. And any portion of this deal can be broken at any time without any real consequences.

Remember when Susan Rice [told an AIPAC audience](#): “Now I want to be very clear: a bad deal is worse than no deal. And if that is the choice then there will be no deal. We are not taking anything on trust. What matters are Iran’s actions, not its words.” [Read the Politico piece](#). The administration’s argument is now the opposite.

There are many alternatives available. The sanctions which Obama keeps telling everyone worked to bring Iran to the table—the ones he fought to constantly weaken—can be strengthened and more international pressure can be brought. Yet, the same administration that has attacked Benjamin Netanyahu for overreacting and overstating the threat of a nuclear Iran now argues that this very moment is the last chance to save the Middle East, no matter how much we have to forfeit in negotiations.

Or, you know, war.

WSJ

The Iraq War and Stubborn Myths

Officials didn’t lie, and I wasn’t fed a line.

by Judith Miller

I took America to war in Iraq. It was all me.

OK, I had some help from a duplicitous vice president, Dick Cheney. Then there was [George W. Bush](#), a gullible president who could barely locate Iraq on a map and who wanted to avenge his father and enrich his friends in the oil business. And don’t forget the neoconservatives in the White House and the Pentagon who fed cherry-picked intelligence about Iraq’s weapons of mass destruction, or WMD, to reporters like me.

None of these assertions happens to be true, though all were published and continue to have believers. This is not how wars come about, and it is surely not how the war in Iraq occurred. Nor is it what I did as a reporter for the [New York Times](#). These false narratives deserve, at last, to be retired.

There was no shortage of mistakes about Iraq, and I made my share of them. The newsworthy claims of some of my prewar WMD stories were wrong. But so is the enduring, pernicious accusation that the Bush administration fabricated WMD intelligence to take the country to war. Before the 2003 invasion, President Bush and other senior officials cited the intelligence community’s incorrect conclusions about Saddam’s WMD capabilities and, on occasion, went

beyond them. But relying on the mistakes of others and errors of judgment are not the same as lying.

I have never met George W. Bush. I never discussed the war with Dick Cheney until the winter of 2012, years after he had left office and I had left the Times. I wish I could have interviewed senior officials before the war about the role that WMDs played in the decision to invade Iraq. The White House's passion for secrecy and aversion to the media made that unlikely. Less senior officials were of help as sources, but they didn't make the decisions.

No senior official spoon-fed me a line about WMD. That would have been so much easier than uncovering classified information that officials can be jailed for disclosing. My sources were the same counterterrorism, arms-control and Middle East analysts on whom I had relied for my stories about [Osama bin Laden](#) and al Qaeda's growing threat to America—a series published eight months before 9/11 for which the Times staff, including me, won a Pulitzer.

In 1996, those same sources helped me to write a book about the dangers of militant Islam long before suicide bombers made the topic fashionable. Their expertise informed articles and another book I co-wrote in 2003 with Times colleagues about the danger of biological terrorism, published right before the deadly anthrax letter attacks.

Another enduring misconception is that intelligence analysts were “pressured” into altering their estimates to suit the policy makers’ push to war. Although a few former officials complained about such pressure, several thorough, bipartisan inquiries found no evidence of it.

The 2005 commission led by former Democratic Sen. Charles Robb and conservative Republican Judge Laurence Silberman called the estimates “dead wrong,” blaming what it called a “major” failure on the intelligence community’s “inability to collect good information...serious errors in analyzing what information it could gather, and a failure to make clear just how much of its analysis was based on assumptions.” A year earlier, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence denounced such failures as the product of “group think,” rooted in a fear of underestimating grave threats to national security in the wake of 9/11.

A two-year study by Charles Duelfer, the former deputy chief of the U.N. inspectors who led America's hunt for WMD in Iraq, concluded that Saddam Hussein was playing a double game, trying (on the one hand) to get sanctions lifted and inspectors out of Iraq and (on the other) to persuade Iran and other foes that he had retained WMD. Not even the Iraqi dictator himself knew for sure what his stockpiles contained, Mr. Duelfer argued. Often forgotten is Mr. Duelfer's well-documented warning that Saddam intended to restore his WMD programs once sanctions were lifted.

Will Tobey, a former deputy administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration (which oversees America's nuclear arsenal), still fumes about the failure to see problems in the CIA's intelligence supporting Secretary of State Colin Powell's now largely discredited prewar speech at the U.N. about Iraq's WMD. Based partly on the CIA's assurances of strong evidence for each claim, Mr. Tobey told me, Mr. Powell was persuaded that the case against Saddam was “rock solid.”

Mr. Powell declined my requests for an interview, but in his 2012 book on leadership, he acknowledges having been annoyed years later when former CIA officials bemoaned his speech's “unsupported claims.” “Where were they,” he wrote, “when the NIE [National Intelligence Estimate] was being prepared months earlier?”

The CIA repeatedly assured President Bush that Saddam Hussein still had WMD. Foreign intelligence agencies, even those whose nations opposed war, shared this view. And so did Congress. Over the previous 15 years, noted Stuart Cohen, the former vice chairman of the National Intelligence Council, none of the congressional committees routinely briefed on Iraqi WMD assessments expressed concern about bias or error.

Though few legislators apparently read the classified version of the 2002 WMD estimate—which contained more caveats than the sanitized “key findings” disclosed in October of that year—almost none disputed the analysts’ conclusion, with “high confidence,” that Saddam retained both chemical and germ weapons, or their view, with “moderate confidence,” that Iraq did not yet have nuclear weapons. Speeches denouncing Saddam’s cheating were given not just by Republican hawks but by prewar GOP skeptic Sen. Chuck Hagel and by senior Democrats Al Gore, [Hillary Clinton](#) and Jay Rockefeller, among others.

Another widespread fallacy is that such neoconservatives as Richard Perle and Paul Wolfowitz strong-armed an inexperienced president into taking the country to war. President Bush, as he himself famously asserted, was the “decider.” One could argue, however, that Hans Blix, the former chief of the international weapons inspectors, bears some responsibility. Though he personally opposed an invasion, Mr. Blix told the U.N. in January 2003 that despite America’s ultimatum, Saddam was still not complying fully with his U.N. pledges. In February, he said “many proscribed weapons and items,” including 1,000 tons of chemical agent, were still “not accounted for.”

Years would pass before U.S. soldiers found remnants of some 5,000 inoperable chemical munitions made before the first Gulf War that Saddam claimed to have destroyed. Not until 2014 would the U.S. learn that some of Iraq’s degraded sarin nerve agent was purer than Americans had expected and was sickening Iraqi and American soldiers who had stumbled upon it.

By then, however, most Americans had concluded that no such weapons existed. These were not new chemical arms, to be sure, but Saddam Hussein’s refusal to account for their destruction was among the reasons the White House cited as justification for war.

NY Times

The Real Reason College Tuition Costs So Much

by Paul F. Campos

BOULDER, Colo. — ONCE upon a time in America, baby boomers paid for college with the money they made from their summer jobs. Then, over the course of the next few decades, public funding for higher education was slashed. These radical cuts forced universities to raise tuition year after year, which in turn forced the millennial generation to take on crushing educational debt loads, and everyone lived unhappily ever after.

This is the story college administrators like to tell when they’re asked to explain why, over the past 35 years, college tuition at public universities has nearly quadrupled, to \$9,139 in 2014 dollars. It is a fairy tale in the worst sense, in that it is not merely false, but rather almost the inverse of the truth.

The conventional wisdom was reflected in a recent National Public Radio series on the cost of college. “So it’s not that colleges are spending more money to educate students,” Sandy Baum

of the Urban Institute told NPR. “It’s that they have to get that money from someplace to replace their lost state funding — and that’s from tuition and fees from students and families.”

In fact, public investment in higher education in America is vastly larger today, in inflation-adjusted dollars, than it was during the supposed golden age of public funding in the 1960s. Such spending has increased at a much faster rate than government spending in general. For example, the military’s budget is about 1.8 times higher today than it was in 1960, while legislative appropriations to higher education are more than 10 times higher.

In other words, far from being caused by funding cuts, the astonishing rise in college tuition correlates closely with a huge increase in public subsidies for higher education. If over the past three decades car prices had gone up as fast as tuition, the average new car would cost more than \$80,000.

Some of this increased spending in education has been driven by a sharp rise in the percentage of Americans who go to college. While the college-age population has not increased since the tail end of the baby boom, the percentage of the population enrolled in college has risen significantly, especially in the last 20 years. Enrollment in undergraduate, graduate and professional programs has increased by almost 50 percent since 1995. As a consequence, while state legislative appropriations for higher education have risen much faster than inflation, total state appropriations per student are somewhat lower than they were at their peak in 1990. (Appropriations per student are much higher now than they were in the 1960s and 1970s, when tuition was a small fraction of what it is today.)

As the baby boomers reached college age, state appropriations to higher education skyrocketed, increasing more than fourfold in today’s dollars, from \$11.1 billion in 1960 to \$48.2 billion in 1975. By 1980, state funding for higher education had increased a mind-boggling 390 percent in real terms over the previous 20 years. This tsunami of public money did not reduce tuition: quite the contrary.

For example, when I was an undergraduate at the University of Michigan in 1980, my parents were paying more than double the resident tuition that undergraduates had been charged in 1960, again in inflation-adjusted terms. And of course tuition has kept rising far faster than inflation in the years since: Resident tuition at Michigan this year is, in today’s dollars, nearly four times higher than it was in 1980.

State appropriations reached a record inflation-adjusted high of \$86.6 billion in 2009. They declined as a consequence of the Great Recession, but have since risen to \$81 billion. And these totals do not include the enormous expansion of the federal Pell Grant program, which has grown, in today’s dollars, to \$34.3 billion per year from \$10.3 billion in 2000.

It is disingenuous to call a large increase in public spending a “cut,” as some university administrators do, because a huge programmatic expansion features somewhat lower per capita subsidies. Suppose that since 1990 the government had doubled the number of military bases, while spending slightly less per base. A claim that funding for military bases was down, even though in fact such funding had nearly doubled, would properly be met with derision.

Interestingly, increased spending has not been going into the pockets of the typical professor. Salaries of full-time faculty members are, on average, barely higher than they were in 1970. Moreover, while 45 years ago 78 percent of college and university professors were full time, today half of postsecondary faculty members are lower-paid part-time employees, meaning that

the average salaries of the people who do the teaching in American higher education are actually quite a bit lower than they were in 1970.

By contrast, a major factor driving increasing costs is the constant expansion of university administration. According to the Department of Education data, administrative positions at colleges and universities grew by 60 percent between 1993 and 2009, which Bloomberg reported was 10 times the rate of growth of tenured faculty positions.

Even more strikingly, an analysis by a professor at California Polytechnic University, Pomona, found that, while the total number of full-time faculty members in the C.S.U. system grew from 11,614 to 12,019 between 1975 and 2008, the total number of administrators grew from 3,800 to 12,183 — a 221 percent increase.

The rapid increase in college enrollment can be defended by intellectually respectable arguments. Even the explosion in administrative personnel is, at least in theory, defensible. On the other hand, there are no valid arguments to support the recent trend toward seven-figure salaries for high-ranking university administrators, unless one considers evidence-free assertions about “the market” to be intellectually rigorous.

What cannot be defended, however, is the claim that tuition has risen because public funding for higher education has been cut. Despite its ubiquity, this claim flies directly in the face of the facts.

Paul F. Campos is a [law professor](#) at the University of Colorado, Boulder, and the author of “Don’t Go to Law School (Unless).”

NY Post

A Kennedy whitewash

by L. Brent Bozell III and Tim Graham

Imagine an eighth grader, presented with a portrayal of Sen. Edward Kennedy, the late patriarch of the “royal family” of American politics.

The student would learn nothing but legends about “the greatest senator of all time,” as Sen. Ed Markey proclaimed.

On the occasion of the opening of an “Edward M. Kennedy Institute” in Boston, “CBS Evening News” anchor Scott Pelley oozed, “Another New England superstar was honored today.

Politics was his game, and we’ll have his story next.” There was not one discouraging word — not even the word “liberal” — applied to arguably the single most left-wing senator of all time.

This is not a bipartisan practice. When President George W. Bush dedicated his library on April 25, 2013, CBS reporter Jim Axelrod insisted that “this library is an intellectual fortress defending one of the most controversial modern presidents, whose time in office saw the [9/11] attack on the US, two wars and the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression.”

The whitewash was so complete that even “Fox News Sunday” host Chris Wallace barked up the carnival: “Up next, our Power Player of the Week: Vicki Kennedy, on her husband’s vision to inspire new generations about the US Senate.”

Wallace noted that Teddy was fiercely partisan, and the second Mrs. Kennedy replied, “He was the proudest Democrat that there was, but the great thing about Teddy was that he always listened to the other side and worked so well with the other side.”

Except he didn’t.

Let us recall his vicious “Robert Bork’s America” speech in 1987, when he stated, “Robert Bork’s America is a land in which women would be forced into back-alley abortions, blacks would sit at segregated lunch counters, rogue police could break down citizens’ doors in midnight raids, schoolchildren could not be taught about evolution, writers and artists would be censored at the whim of government.”

But NBC brought on his son Patrick Kennedy to proclaim, “My dad was always an optimist. I mean, having overcome so many of his own personal challenges and political challenges — I mean, this was a guy that everyone loved. Why? Because he persevered.”

One might expect Teddy’s politician son to spin things this way, but it doesn’t mean the hyperbole should go unchallenged by a discerning press. “A guy that everyone loved?” The 1970s, 1980s and 1990s would beg to differ.

In these “superstar” tributes, there was no talk of womanizing, before and after the senator got divorced from Joan Kennedy in 1982. Gearing up for Kennedy’s presidential run in 1979, Time magazine ran a piece titled “Sex and the Senior Senator.”

It wrote, “The mere mention of Edward Kennedy’s social life is enough to make an editor’s head throb.”

It lamented out loud about how to handle the topic, concluding with a DC dinner party where “14 talented and interesting men and women talked of nothing but [Kennedy’s] sexual activities.”

But now? Sen. John McCain announced on “Face the Nation” on CBS that Kennedy was a man of his word (and his vows?): “Ted always kept his word. The only times I saw him angry was when somebody didn’t keep their word to him.”

At the opening ceremonies, President Obama shamelessly asked, “What if we carried ourselves more like Ted Kennedy? What if we worked to follow his example a little bit harder?”

Does this involve his driving habits? Oh, that.

The double standard also happened in newspapers. With Bush in 2013, New York Times reporter Peter Baker gave Bush-bashers their due, writing, “While critics have fumed about what they called the whitewashing of his record in the media blitz leading up to the library dedication, many Americans have been reminded about aspects of Mr. Bush they once liked.”

But the Times published two gush-filled articles on Teddy, without a single mention of a Kennedy critic.

Reporter Carl Hulse wrote, "Members of the [Kennedy] institute's staff said it was not too late for younger Americans to learn how to tolerate an opposing point of view."

But is it too late for journalists to learn journalism?



