

July 27, 2015

The president's "dangerous rhetoric" gets a look from Victor Davis Hanson.

*President Obama has a habit of asserting strategic nonsense with such certainty that it is at times embarrassing and frightening. Nowhere is that more evident than in his rhetoric about the Middle East.*

*Not long ago, Obama reassured the world that, despite evidence of the use of chemical weapons in Syria, "Chlorine itself is not listed as a chemical weapon." What could he have meant by that? Obama apparently was referring to the focus on Sarin gas by the Organization for Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, the UN watchdog agency that was supposed to monitor Obama's Syria red line warnings against further gas attacks. To reassure the public that the United States would not consider chlorine gas a violation of its own red line about chemical weapons use in Syria—and, therefore, to assure the public that his administration would not intervene militarily in Syria—Obama said: "Chlorine itself, historically, has not been listed as a chemical weapon."*

*Nothing could be further from the truth. Chlorine was the father of poison gas, the first chemical agent used in World War I—and it was used to lethal effect by the Germans at the battle of Ypres in April 1915. Subsequently, it was mixed and upgraded with phosgene gas to make an even deadlier brew and employed frequently throughout the war—most infamously at the Battle of the Somme.*

*The president was clearly bothered that he had boxed himself into a rhetorical corner and might have had to order air strikes against the defiant Assad regime—lest he appear wavering in carrying out his earlier threats. One way out of that dilemma would be to deny that chlorine constituted a serious weapon used to kill soldiers and civilians. Another would simply be to claim that he had never issued such a red line to Bashar al-Assad at all. That refuge is exactly what Obama fell back upon at press conference on September 4, 2013: "I didn't set a red line. The world set a red line." ...*

*... Yanking all Americans out of Iraq in 2011 was solely a short-term political decision designed as a 2012 reelection talking point. The American departure had nothing to do with a disinterested assessment of the long-term security of the still shaky Iraqi consensual government. When Senator Obama damned the invasion of Iraq in 2003; when he claimed in 2004 that he had no policy differences with the Bush administration on Iraq; when he declared in 2007 that the surge would fail; when he said in 2008 as a presidential candidate that he wanted all U.S. troops brought home; when he opined as President in 2011 that the country was stable and self-reliant; when he assured the world in 2014 that it was not threatened by ISIS; and when in 2015 he sent troops back into an imploding Iraq—all of these decisions hinged on perceived public opinion, not empirical assessments of the state of Iraq itself. The near destruction of Iraq and the rise of ISIS were the logical dividends of a decade of politicized ambiguity. ...*

Heather Mac Donald on micro-aggression and macro crazy.

*Early this year, the University of California's president, Janet Napolitano, asked all deans and department chairs in the university's ten campuses to undergo training in overcoming their "implicit biases" toward women and minorities. The department heads also needed training, according to the UC president, in how to avoid committing microaggressions, those acts of alleged racism that are invisible to the naked eye. A more insulting and mindless exercise would*

*be hard to imagine. But Napolitano's seminar possesses a larger significance: it demolishes any remaining hope that college administrators possess a firmer grip on reality than the narcissistic students over whom they preside.*

*The "Fostering Inclusive Excellence: Strategies and Tools for Department Chairs and Deans" seminar presumes that University of California faculty are so bigoted that they will refuse to hire the most qualified candidate for a professorship if that candidate happens to be female or an "underrepresented minority"—i.e., black or Hispanic. ...*

*... The ultimate question raised by the seminar is: Are there any adults left on campus, at least in administrative offices? And the answer is: no. An adult administrator would realize that he is presiding over the most tolerant, well-meaning, and opportunity-filled community in human history. He would understand that the claim that females and minorities are the victims of discrimination on campuses is sheer fiction. He would know that teaching students to go around ferreting out imaginary slights does them a disservice.*

*Maybe that administrator is so cowardly that, while he knows these things, he is not willing to assert them in the face of student agitation for more victim infrastructure. Such cowardice is deeply unfortunate. But at least it holds out the possibility for some return to sanity at a later date. The most disturbing aspect of "Fostering Inclusive Excellence" is that it was initiated by the president's office without outside provocation. Had Napolitano not come up with these antibias trainings, no one would have noticed their absence. Instead, she has sua sponte promulgated an initiative deeply ignorant about how seriously most professors—at least in the sciences—take their responsibilities to build up a faculty of accomplishment and research prowess. We have come to expect such ignorance from coddled, self-engrossed students. Now it turns out that those students may be the least of the university's problems.*

**The Federalist** says Uber gives freedom to women.

*Mayor Bill de Blasio is waging a war against Uber, working overtime to pass legislation that would dramatically limit the ability of ride-sharing companies to operate in New York City. He justifies this crackdown as a way to "keep people safe," but in reality, de Blasio's anti-free market Uber policy would do the exact opposite.*

*Uber is the best thing to happen to women since the invention of birth control. It allows us to leave when we want without relying on a man to get us home. To understand how empowering this notion is, de Blasio might consider walking in our red stilettos one Saturday night.*

*Of course, not every woman needs an app to escape a bad date, but Uber provides a safety net for those that do. With Uber, women don't need a permission slip to leave the dinner table. We don't need to stay for "one more drink," and we certainly don't need to deal with the anxiety of hailing for a cab that might never come. No. With Uber, we just click a button, and our car arrives. ...*

More defense of Uber from **John Stossel**.

*Hillary Clinton gave a speech warning that the new "sharing economy" of businesses such as the rideshare company Uber is "raising hard questions about workplace protections."*

*Democrats hate what labor unions hate, and a taxi drivers' union hates Uber, too. Its NYC website proclaims, "Uber has the money. But we are the PEOPLE!"*

*The taxi cartels, which provide inferior service and are micromanaged by government, don't like getting competition from efficient companies like Uber.*

*Clinton didn't mention Uber by name, but we don't have to wonder which company she meant. The New York Times reports that Clinton contacted Uber and told them her speech would threaten to "crack down" on companies that don't treat independent contractors as full employees. Apparently, Democrats think something's wrong if people are independent contractors.*

*But no driver is forced to work for Uber. People volunteer. They like the flexibility. They like getting more use out of their cars. It's win-win-win. Drivers earn money, customers save money while gaining convenience and Uber makes money. Why does Clinton insist on interfering with that?*

*Clinton's "social democrat" pal, New York's Mayor Bill de Blasio, wants to crack down on Uber by limiting how many drivers they may hire. Uber cleverly responded with an app — a "de Blasio option" — that shows people how much longer they'd have to wait if de Blasio gets his way. ...*

The cartoonists are on to Planned Parenthood.

---

---

---

## **Hoover Institution** **Obama's Dangerous Rhetoric**

by Victor Davis Hanson

President Obama has a habit of asserting strategic nonsense with such certainty that it is at times embarrassing and frightening. Nowhere is that more evident than in his rhetoric about the Middle East.

Not long ago, Obama reassured the world that, despite evidence of the use of chemical weapons in Syria, "Chlorine itself is not listed as a chemical weapon." What could he have meant by that? Obama apparently was referring to the focus on Sarin gas by the Organization for Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, the UN watchdog agency that was supposed to monitor Obama's Syria red line warnings against further gas attacks. To reassure the public that the United States would not consider chlorine gas a violation of its own red line about chemical weapons use in Syria—and, therefore, to assure the public that his administration would not intervene militarily in Syria—Obama said: "Chlorine itself, historically, has not been listed as a chemical weapon."

Nothing could be further from the truth. Chlorine was the father of poison gas, the first chemical agent used in World War I—and it was used to lethal effect by the Germans at the battle of Ypres in April 1915. Subsequently, it was mixed and upgraded with phosgene gas to make an

even deadlier brew and employed frequently throughout the war—most infamously at the Battle of the Somme.

The president was clearly bothered that he had boxed himself into a rhetorical corner and might have had to order air strikes against the defiant Assad regime—lest he appear wavering in carrying out his earlier threats. One way out of that dilemma would be to deny that chlorine constituted a serious weapon used to kill soldiers and civilians. Another would simply be to claim that he had never issued such a red line to Bashar al-Assad at all. That refuge is exactly what Obama fell back upon at press conference on September 4, 2013: “I didn’t set a red line. The world set a red line.”

Here is what the president had earlier stated on August 20, 2012, in threatening Assad: “We have been very clear to the Assad regime, but also to other players on the ground, that a red line for us is we start seeing a whole bunch of chemical weapons moving around or being utilized. That would change my calculus. That would change my equation.”

The use of the presidential pronouns “we” and “my” are synonymous with the voice of his administration. Indeed, Obama had doubled down on his 2012 red line with the clarification that, “When I said that the use of chemical weapons would be a game-changer, that wasn’t unique to—that wasn’t a position unique to the United States and it shouldn’t have been a surprise.”

In the summer of 2014, Obama had dismissed the emergence of ISIS with colorful language about its inability to project terrorism much beyond its local Iraqi embryo: “I think the analogy we use around here sometimes, and I think is accurate, is if a JV team puts on Lakers uniforms, that doesn’t make them Kobe Bryant. I think there is a distinction between the capacity and reach of a bin Laden and a network that is actively planning major terrorist plots against the homeland versus jihadists who are engaged in various local power struggles and disputes, often sectarian.”

ISIS, remember, had already conducted terrorist operations across the Mediterranean. Both organized and lone-wolf terrorists, with claims of ISIS ties or inspiration, would go on to attack Westerners from France to Texas.

Obama compounded his obfuscations by later claiming to Meet the Press anchor Chuck Todd that he had never said such a thing at all about ISIS—an assertion that was deemed false by even the liberal fact-checking organization PolitiFact. More recently, in July 2015, Obama claimed that the now growing ISIS threat could not be addressed through force of arms, assuring the world that “Ideologies are not defeated with guns, they are defeated by better ideas.”

Such a generic assertion seems historically preposterous. The defeat of German Nazism, Italian fascism, and Japanese militarism was not accomplished by Anglo-American rhetoric on freedom. What stopped the growth of Soviet-style global communism during the Cold War were both armed interventions such as the Korean War and real threats to use force such as during the Berlin Airlift and Cuban Missile Crisis— along with Ronald Reagan’s resoluteness backed by a military buildup that restored credible Western military deterrence.

In contrast, Obama apparently believes that strategic threats are not checked with tough diplomacy backed by military alliances, balances of power, and military deterrence, much less by speaking softly and carrying a big stick. Rather, crises are resolved by ironing out mostly Western-inspired misunderstandings and going back on heat-of-the-moment, ad hoc issued

deadlines, red lines, and step-over lines, whether to the Iranian theocracy, Vladimir Putin, or Bashar Assad.

Sometimes the administration's faith in Western social progressivism is offered to persuade an Iran or Cuba that they have missed the arc of Westernized history—and must get back on the right side of the past by loosening the reins of their respective police states. Obama believes that engagement with Iran in non-proliferation talks—which have so far given up on prior Western insistences on third-party, out of the country enrichment, on-site inspections, and kick-back sanctions—will inevitably ensure that Iran becomes “a successful regional power.” That higher profile of the theocracy apparently is a good thing for the Middle East and our allies like Israel and the Gulf states.

In his well-publicized Cairo speech of June 2009, Obama declared that Islam had a hand in prompting the Western Renaissance and Enlightenment, as well as offering other underappreciated gifts to the West, from medicine to navigation. Obama's tutorial was offered to remind the Muslim Brotherhood members in his audience that the West really does owe much to the Muslim World—and thus by inference should expect reciprocal consideration in the current war on terror.

In his February 2, 2015 outline of anti-ISIS strategy—itsself an update of an earlier September 2014 strategic précis—Obama again insisted that “one of the best antidotes to the hateful ideologies that try to recruit and radicalize people to violent extremism is our own example as diverse and tolerant societies that welcome the contributions of all people, including people of all faiths.” The idea, a naïve one, is that because we welcome mosques on our diverse and tolerant soil, ISIS will take note and welcome Christian churches.

One of Obama's former State Department advisors, Georgetown law professor Rosa Brooks, recently amplified that reductionist confidence in the curative power of Western progressivism. She urged Americans to tweet ISIS, which, like Iran, habitually executes homosexuals. Brooks hoped that Americans would pass on stories about and photos of the Supreme Court's recent embrace of gay marriage: “Do you want to fight the Islamic State and the forces of Islamic extremist terrorism? I'll tell you the best way to send a message to those masked gunmen in Iraq and Syria and to everyone else who gains power by sowing violence and fear. Just keep posting that second set of images [photos of American gays and their supporters celebrating the Supreme Court decision]. Post them on Facebook and Twitter and Reddit and in comments all over the Internet. Send them to your friends and your family. Send them to your pen pal in France and your old roommate in Tunisia. Send them to strangers.”

Such zesty confidence in the redemptive power of Western moral superiority recalls First Lady Michelle Obama's efforts to persuade the murderous Boko Haram to return kidnapped Nigerian preteen girls. Ms. Obama appealed to Boko Haram on the basis of shared empathy and universal parental instincts. (“In these girls, Barack and I see our own daughters. We see their hopes, their dreams and we can only imagine the anguish their parents are feeling right now.”) Ms. Obama then fortified her message with a photo of her holding up a sign with the hash-tag #BringBackOurGirls.

Vladimir Putin's Russia has added Crimea and Eastern Ukraine to his earlier acquisitions in Georgia. He is most likely eyeing the Baltic States next. China is creating new strategic realities in the Pacific, in which Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, and the Philippines will eventually either be forced to acquiesce or to seek their own nuclear deterrent. The Middle East has imploded. Much of North Africa is becoming a Mogadishu-like wasteland.

The assorted theocrats, terrorists, dictators, and tribalists express little fear of or respect for the U.S. They believe that the Obama administration does not know much nor cares about foreign affairs. They may be right in their cynicism. A president who does not consider chlorine gas a chemical weapon could conceivably believe that the Americans once liberated Auschwitz, that the Austrians speak an Austrian language, and that the Falklands are known in Latin America as the Maldives.

Both friends and enemies assume that what Obama or his administration says today will be either rendered irrelevant or denied tomorrow. Iraq at one point was trumpeted by Vice President Joe Biden as the administration's probable "greatest achievement." Obama declared that Iraq was a "stable and self-reliant" country in no need of American peacekeepers after 2011.

Yanking all Americans out of Iraq in 2011 was solely a short-term political decision designed as a 2012 reelection talking point. The American departure had nothing to do with a disinterested assessment of the long-term security of the still shaky Iraqi consensual government. When Senator Obama damned the invasion of Iraq in 2003; when he claimed in 2004 that he had no policy differences with the Bush administration on Iraq; when he declared in 2007 that the surge would fail; when he said in 2008 as a presidential candidate that he wanted all U.S. troops brought home; when he opined as President in 2011 that the country was stable and self-reliant; when he assured the world in 2014 that it was not threatened by ISIS; and when in 2015 he sent troops back into an imploding Iraq—all of these decisions hinged on perceived public opinion, not empirical assessments of the state of Iraq itself. The near destruction of Iraq and the rise of ISIS were the logical dividends of a decade of politicized ambiguity.

After six years, even non-Americans have caught on that the more Obama flip-flops on Iraq, deprecates an enemy, or ignores Syrian redlines, the less likely American arms will ever be used and assurances honored.

The world is going to become an even scarier place in the next two years. The problem is not just that our enemies do not believe our President, but rather that they no longer even listen to him.

## City Journal

### [Microaggression, Macro-Crazy](#)

*The University of California keeps upping the ante in its search for imaginary bias.*

by Heather Mac Donald

Early this year, the University of California's president, Janet Napolitano, asked all deans and department chairs in the university's ten campuses to undergo training in overcoming their "implicit biases" toward women and minorities. The department heads also needed training, according to the UC president, in how to avoid committing [microaggressions, those acts of alleged racism that are invisible to the naked eye](#). A more insulting and mindless exercise would be hard to imagine. But Napolitano's seminar possesses a larger significance: it demolishes any remaining hope that college administrators possess a firmer grip on reality than the narcissistic students over whom they preside.

The "[Fostering Inclusive Excellence: Strategies and Tools for Department Chairs and Deans](#)" seminar presumes that University of California faculty are so bigoted that they will refuse to hire the most qualified candidate for a professorship if that candidate happens to be female or an "underrepresented minority"—i.e., black or Hispanic. Attendees at the seminar were subjected to an "interactive theater scenario" called "Ready to Vote?" that showed white male computer-science professors on a fictional hiring committee belittling females and failing to "value diversity." The author of the scenario, a professor of performance studies and ethnic studies at the University of California, San Diego, seems never to have attended a faculty-hiring committee meeting in her life. Nor, it would seem, has Janet Napolitano. How otherwise could they not know that every faculty search in the sciences, far from shunning females and URMs, is a desperate exercise in tracking down even remotely qualified female and non-Asian minority candidates who haven't already been snapped up by more well-endowed competitors? Females in the sciences are [hired and promoted](#) nationwide at rates far above their representation in applicant pools. (Too few URM science Ph.D.s exist to have inspired many reliable studies analyzing their hiring chances.)

The "Fostering Inclusive Excellence" seminar supplemented the patent fictions in "[Ready to Vote?](#)" with an equally specious handout, "Identifying Implicit Bias," which claims that females and URMs are required to meet higher academic standards than white males and that their work is scrutinized more closely by hiring committees. This conceit was preposterous 30 years ago when it first became widespread and is even more so today. True, there *is* a double standard in hiring, but it redounds to the benefit of females and URMs, as anyone with the remotest exposure to academic culture should know. An entire subspecialty of diversity agitation argues that nontraditional forms of scholarship, such as personal memoirs or the collective editing of anthologies, should be viewed as equivalent to publications in peer-reviewed journals during tenure evaluations, when URMs and females are performing those activities. The advocacy for nontraditional credentials for "diverse" candidates has largely succeeded, especially in the social sciences and humanities.

To voice these realities, however, is to commit a microaggression, according to University of California diversity enforcers. Another handout inflicted on "Fostering Inclusive Excellence" attendees presents a long list of microaggressions, categorized by "Theme" and "Message." The "Myth of Meritocracy" "theme" includes such statements as: "Of course he'll get tenure, even though he hasn't published much—he's Black!" The "message" conveyed by this particular microaggression, according to UC's "[Recognizing Microaggressions Tool](#)," is that "people of color are given extra unfair benefits because of their race." Now where would anyone get that idea? Well, you might ask any high school senior, steeped in his class's SAT rankings, if it's true that "people of color" are given "extra benefits" in college admissions. He will laugh at your naïveté. A [2004 study](#) of three top-tier universities, published in *Social Science Quarterly*, found that blacks were favored over whites by a factor of 5.5 and that being black got students an extra 230 SAT points on a 1,600-point scale. Such massive preferences for URMs are found at every selective college and graduate school. Every student knows this, and yet diversity protocol requires pretending that preferences don't exist. The race (and gender) advantage continues into the academic workplace, as everyone who has sat on a hiring committee also knows. But President Napolitano is determined to brand anyone who violates that collective fiction as a closet racist, someone who targets "persons based solely upon their marginalized group membership," in the words of the "Microaggressions Tool."

Other alleged microaggressions include uttering such hurtful words as "I believe the most qualified person should get the job" or "America is the land of opportunity" on a UC campus. Someone who has been through the "Fostering Inclusive Excellence" seminar may call you out for giving voice to such ideas. Why *exactly* saying that the most qualified person should get the

job is a microaggression is a puzzle. Either such a statement is regarded simply as code for alleged antiblack sentiment, or the diversocrats are secretly aware that meritocracy is incompatible with “diversity.”

Equally “hostile” and “derogatory,” according to the “Tool,” is the phrase “Everyone can succeed in this society, if they work hard enough.” Such a statement is obviously an insult to all those career victims whose primary occupation is proclaiming their own helplessness and inability to accomplish anything without government assistance.

Many purported microaggressions arise from the contradictions in diversity ideology. Authorities in a diversity regime are supposed to categorize people by race and ethnicity—until that unpredictable moment when they are *not* supposed to. Assigning a black graduate student to escort a black visiting professor, for example, is a microaggression, per the “Tool.” But wasn’t the alleged need for role models and a critical mass of “persons of color” a key justification for “diversity”? Describing a colleague as a “good Black scientist” is another microaggression. But such a categorization merely reflects the race-consciousness and bean-counting that the campus diversity enforcers insist upon.

Color-blindness constitutes an entire microaggression “Theme” in the “Tool,” *pace* Martin Luther King, Jr. Beware of saying, “When I look at you, I don’t see color” or “There is only one race, the human race.” Doing so, according to the “Tool,” denies “the individual as a racial/cultural being.” Never mind that diversity ideologues reject the genetic basis of racial categories and proclaim that race is merely a “social construct.” The non-diverse world is under orders both to deny that race exists and to “acknowledge race,” in Tool-parlance, regarding Persons of Color.

Other microaggressions provide a glimpse into the future. It may seem like a stretch today to label as a microaggression “being forced to choose Male or Female when completing basic forms,” but it won’t remain a stretch for long. The movement to discredit binary, biological sex distinctions is accelerating weekly; expect more institutions to accede to the demand to allow their members to choose from an array of “gender” possibilities and combinations or face protest.

Though participation in “Fostering Inclusive Excellence” was, in theory, voluntary, Napolitano had informed the deans and chairs that she would be briefed on attendance and the “tenor of the conversations.” Her office would not disclose the turnout for the seminars. It would be a good barometer for whether the faculty possesses any remaining spine.

The ultimate question raised by the seminar is: Are there any adults left on campus, at least in administrative offices? And the answer is: no. An adult administrator would realize that he is presiding over the most tolerant, well-meaning, and opportunity-filled community in human history. He would understand that the claim that females and minorities are the victims of discrimination on campuses is sheer fiction. He would know that teaching students to go around ferreting out imaginary slights does them a disservice.

Maybe that administrator is so cowardly that, while he knows these things, he is not willing to assert them in the face of student agitation for more victim infrastructure. Such cowardice is deeply unfortunate. But at least it holds out the possibility for some return to sanity at a later date. The most disturbing aspect of “Fostering Inclusive Excellence” is that it was initiated by the president’s office without outside provocation. Had Napolitano not come up with these antibias trainings, no one would have noticed their absence. Instead, she has *sua sponte* promulgated an initiative deeply ignorant about how seriously most professors—at least in the sciences—take their responsibilities to build up a faculty of accomplishment and research prowess. We



have come to expect such ignorance from coddled, self-engrossed students. Now it turns out that those students may be the least of the university's problems.

## The Federalist

### [Mayor De Blasio, Don't Set Women Back By Shackling Uber](#)

***Politicians should welcome Uber, a creative ride-sharing service that enables women to be more safe and self-reliant.***

by Kelsey Harkness

Mayor Bill de Blasio is waging a war against Uber, working overtime to pass legislation that would dramatically limit the ability of ride-sharing companies to operate in New York City. He justifies this crackdown as a way to “keep people safe,” but in reality, de Blasio’s anti-free market Uber policy would do the exact opposite.

Uber is the best thing to happen to women since the invention of birth control. It allows us to leave when we want without relying on a man to get us home. To understand how empowering this notion is, de Blasio might consider walking in our red stilettos one Saturday night.

Of course, not every woman needs an app to escape a bad date, but Uber provides a safety net for those that do. With Uber, women don’t need a permission slip to leave the dinner table. We don’t need to stay for “one more drink,” and we certainly don’t need to deal with the anxiety of hailing for a cab that might never come. No. With Uber, we just click a button, and our car arrives.

Politicians should welcome this creative service that enables women to be more safe and self-reliant—not stand in its way.

In a [New York Daily News op-ed](#) explaining his stance against Uber, de Blasio cited “protecting riders” as one of his top concerns.

“Uber shouldn’t get immunity if one of its drivers attacks or injures a customer,” he wrote.

Women ordering Uber are far less concerned about their drivers attacking them than they are of being attacked by the criminals trolling your city’s streets.

With all due respect, Mr. Mayor, let’s get one thing straight. Women ordering Uber are far less concerned about their drivers attacking them than they are of being attacked by the criminals trolling your city’s streets.

When I first moved to New York City in 2011, Uber was still an infant. Back then, I didn’t read crime reports, and appreciated the car service more for its role in saving me from mistakes involving men. Four years later, now living in Washington DC, I appreciate Uber for a different reason.

Just this month, my neighborhood experienced [three murders in the span of two weeks](#). The attacks were part of a larger crime wave that has residents like me, who live alone and walk to and from work, on edge. It’s nearly impossible for me to carry a gun (DC has some of the

strictest gun laws in the country), and when I went to purchase pepper spray, I discovered that, too, is illegal to ship in the District.

Luckily, I still have Uber. And until taxicabs can arrive on-demand, right outside my doorstep, they'll never provide that same protection.

De Blasio, who attacks Uber while collecting big-dollar political donations from the taxi industry, claims his policy will also "protect" us from unfair costs.

"Riders deserve honest rates and security against surge-pricing schemes that look an awful lot like price-gouging," he wrote. Mr. Mayor. Women don't need politicians telling us whether Uber's "surge prices" are worth our money. We're plenty capable of making financial decisions on our own.

If (or when) Uber's prices do get out of control, the great thing about a free market is that another ride-sharing company can step in. Uber works by being affordable, and "price-gouging" its customers will eventually prove unsustainable.

What out-of-touch politicians like De Blasio most importantly need to realize is that in some situations, a safe ride home is worth any amount of "surge." Taking that away, he might find, could cost women in New York a whole lot more. It'll just be more difficult to see.

## **Jewish World Review**

### **[The War on Uber](#)**

by John Stossel

Hillary Clinton gave a speech warning that the new "sharing economy" of businesses such as the rideshare company Uber is "raising hard questions about workplace protections."

Democrats hate what labor unions hate, and a taxi drivers' union hates Uber, too. Its NYC website proclaims, "Uber has the money. But we are the PEOPLE!"

The taxi cartels, which provide inferior service and are micromanaged by government, don't like getting competition from efficient companies like Uber.

Clinton didn't mention Uber by name, but we don't have to wonder which company she meant. The New York Times reports that Clinton contacted Uber and told them her speech would threaten to "crack down" on companies that don't treat independent contractors as full employees. Apparently, Democrats think something's wrong if people are independent contractors.

But no driver is forced to work for Uber. People volunteer. They like the flexibility. They like getting more use out of their cars. It's win-win-win. Drivers earn money, customers save money while gaining convenience and Uber makes money. Why does Clinton insist on interfering with that?

Clinton's "social democrat" pal, New York's Mayor Bill de Blasio, wants to crack down on Uber by limiting how many drivers they may hire. Uber cleverly responded with an app — a "de Blasio option" — that shows people how much longer they'd have to wait if de Blasio gets his way.

Good for Uber for fighting back. I wish more companies did.

Federal Express didn't.

FedEx classified drivers as independent contractors. Again, drivers were willing to drive, FedEx was willing to pay, and customers got packages faster and more reliably than they did from the U.S. Postal Service.

But lawyers built a class action suit on behalf of FedEx drivers, saying they *should* be treated as employees, paying payroll tax, getting workman's compensation, receiving benefits. FedEx settled the case for \$228 million and began abandoning its independent contractor system.

Uber's use of independent drivers — who use their own cars — is now called analogous to FedEx's use of delivery drivers.

That means Uber may soon have to treat its drivers as employees. Business analysts at ZenPayroll estimate that the changes will cost \$209 million. We customers will pay for that, and we'll have fewer ride-share choices, too.

Lawsuits and politicians' attacks against one company have a chilling effect on others. The "independent contractor" assault will destroy all sorts of companies we'll never even know about because now they won't come into existence.

Some of the entrepreneurs who dreamed of starting them will look at the additional costs, crunch the numbers and decide there's not enough profit potential to risk investing their money.

Who knows what odd but popular sharing-economy innovations aren't happening even now — ones we'd use and love — because businesspeople with great ideas are frightened by the Clintons, deBlasios and lawyers?

In France, the old-fashioned cabbies rioted against Uber, blocking Uber cars and dropping rocks on them from a bridge. Instead of arresting rioters, the French government threatened to arrest Uber executives for breaking taxi rules. Once again, without even a new law directed specifically at Uber, the enemies of free choice got their way. Paris police have been ordered to forbid use of the Uber app.

I disagree with Jeb Bush about many things, but he was right to praise Uber for "disrupting the old order" of business.

The New York Times responded with a sarcastic piece pointing out that when Bush used an Uber car, the driver, Munir Algazaly, didn't recognize Bush. He said he plans to vote for Clinton, though Bush seemed like a "nice guy." Another site mocked Bush because he talked about "hailing" an Uber, not "hiring" one. Another pointed out that the car Bush rode in had a license plate holder that said "Fresh as F—" on it. Ha, ha.

But it's the sneering media who miss the point. Bush is smart to see serious benefits from "reputation" businesses like Uber. Politicians and lawyers who threaten to destroy such companies threaten us all.





# PROGRESS?



# Planned Parenthood

ALWAYS LOW PRICES.



SALE!

Always!

Andy Marlette  
News Journal  
© Cre8tor's.com 2011

BRANCO LegalInsurrection.com  
©2015







