

## EXCEPTIONAL GROVELING by P-BOB

Stephen L. Bakke – April 8, 2009

*European Vision* – It is argued that some on the Left think that the U.S. should follow policies more like those in Europe, and would even pattern some judicial decisions on certain European precedents ..... (conservatives) point out that the U.S. leads the world in too many areas for us to start imitating those who are trailing behind ..... I have read that the European practice of “statism trumping religion” has been influencing America for many decades – even centuries.

*World Citizens* – ..... This view came through very clearly when Barack Obama emphasized to those present at his German rally that they were all “citizens of the world” and “the burdens of global citizenship continue to bind us together”. Some on the Left seem to prefer to identify as citizens of the world. The Right would identify first as citizens of America ..... In his book, “The Audacity of Hope”, Obama wrote: “When the world’s sole superpower willingly restrains its power and abides by internationally agreed-upon standards of conduct, it sends a message that these rules are worth following”.

*American Exceptionalism* – The Left seems to regard the notion of American exceptionalism as chauvinism. Conservatives would tend to proclaim that, in spite of all its mistakes, America has done more than any international organization or institution, and more than any other country, to improve the world; and that traditional American values form the finest value system any society has ever devised and lived by. Many on the Left would regard world opinion, e.g. the U.N., as a better arbiter of what is good than is America.

So wrote “I” in my December 2008 analysis of conservative and liberal thinking. It’s all so true!

---

To me it’s almost “spooky” how the liberal thinking of our President is so predictable. P-BOB’s recent world travels and use of the “TOTUS” (Teleprompter of the United States) sent ripples/waves of concern through many in the “loyal opposition”. I hear he brought twelve TOTI (that’s the plural form of TOTUS) along with him. When he assumes his position behind the TOTUS, henceforth that will be referred to as “PATOTUS” (Position at the TOTUS). The late famous editorial cartoonist and author “Herblock” wrote in one of his books something like “You too can have the soothing feeling of nature’s own baby-soft wool being pulled gently over your resting eyes”. So recalls economist/writer Thomas Sowell while stating that’s how he feels every time P-BOB assumes his PATOTUS. While making a show of what he considers leadership, he really just turns around, bends over and gives the world an opportunity to “shove it” to the United States.

### *Groveling and Putting Down America*

At the G-20 meeting in London, a joint communiqué (that included our leader) essentially announced a global economic union with uniform regulations and bylaws for all nations, whereby, if I understand it correctly, our SEC, Commodities Trading Commission, Federal

Reserve Board and other regulators would have to answer to the Financial Stability Board (FSB). The FSB will be made up of a body of central bankers from each of the G-20 states, and would set a framework of international standards which would apply to regulation and oversight of “all systemically important financial institutions, instruments, and markets”, and would include hedge funds. Principles of pay and compensation would also be set by the FSB. Dick Morris characterizes this as P-BOB essentially agreeing because of his sense of guilt for the U.S. role triggering the international financial crisis and “has, indeed, given away the store. Now we may no longer look to presidential appointees, confirmed by the Senate, to make policy for our economy. These decisions will be made internationally”. Talk about promoting world citizenship at the expense of our sovereignty! Talk about total rejection of the concept of “American Exceptionalism”! Talk about turning around, bending over, and inviting all comers!

Maybe Americans are no longer considered exceptional by P-BOB, but his groveling most certainly was more than exceptional. He met with the Saudi king in London and actually bowed deeply. That isn't proper protocol, or at least it wasn't in the past. Mona Charen characterized the deep bow as “more than a courtesy; it was abasement”. In France he assumed his PATOTUS and proceeded to almost proclaim that American arrogance is to blame for many of the world's problems. He announced “that there have been times where America has shown arrogance and been dismissive, even derisive” toward Europe. I'm sorry but I didn't know that Europeans had such a grand excuse for being resentful. I always thought we “saved their bacon” a number of times in the past – and in more recent history kept them reasonably safe.

On to Ankara, Turkey where, among other things, he exclaimed appreciation for the Islamic faith and what it's done over many centuries to shape the world and the U.S. for the better. Can't you just see him bending over? Remember, one of P-BOB's first official acts was to grant an interview to Al Arabiya, the Arabic language network that broadcasts worldwide. Just like in Europe last week he began by criticizing America for dictating by not listening when it came to relations with the Muslim world. Is that what he believes caused 9/11 – that we don't listen to and understand radical elements?

I think P-BOB made a big mistake by clearly putting down his predecessor W while on official trips overseas. (W would never have done such a tacky thing to his predecessor - seriously!) But there he was last week, blaming the Muslim/American “bad blood” on W. Characterizing Bush in this way has been described as clear libel. After 9/11 W went out of his way to tell the nation that we were not at war with Islam, and feelings of anger towards American Muslims would be misplaced. And he arguable saved more Muslim lives from his African AIDS initiative than any other nation can claim, while Mrs. Bush made improving lives of women and girls in Afghanistan her special project.

The President's recent visit to Prague gave him an extra chance to assume his PATOTUS and expand on one of the things near and dear to his heart – nuclear disarmament. It's so dear to his heart that one of the few foreign policy initiatives to which Obama stuck his name during his fleeting time in the Senate was an increase in funding for nuclear nonproliferation. Harken back to my quote above that about the world's “sole superpower” restraining its power and abiding by “international standards”. Here we go. Apparently he really believes that if the U.S. unilaterally cuts its own nuclear arsenal and bans testing others will follow. Forgive my loyal

cynicism, but what evidence is there that U.S. arms reductions in the past has inspired others to do the same? All the recent nuclear powers – Israel, Pakistan and India – acquired their capabilities after the U.S. instigated nuclear disarmament talks over 40 years ago. And North Korea? They chose the very day of the Prague speech to launch an experimental missile – and notably neither China nor Russia condemned the launch. And if I remember correctly, his moment at the TOTUS included a reminder that the U.S. is the only nation to ever have actually used a nuclear weapon during warfare. Run your country down, Obama, apologize for the U.S., and make sure your groveling is truly convincing. GOOD GRIEF!

Rich Lowry wrote that P-BOB, in setting this disarmament goal, “hitched himself to a project as utopian as ..... Bush’s ambition to end tyranny in the world. In fact, they are essentially the same goal. P-BOB’s theory is that our arsenal makes us nuclear hypocrites. Only by its elimination do we gain the moral standing to pressure other nations to give up their nuclear ambitions.” Doesn’t the President understand that for these rogue nations, the fact that we eliminate our weapons gives them and their purpose even more incentive and momentum to move ahead to gain power, prestige and protection? So sincerely and sadly naïve is P-BOB.

One of my favorites, Dennis Prager, puts it so well: “It’s hard to imagine a more destructive goal. A nuclear disarmed America would lead to massive and widespread killing, more genocide, and very possibly the nuclear holocaust worldwide nuclear disarmament is meant to prevent ..... It’s inconceivable that every nation would agree to it ..... What any president of the United States should aspire to is: 1) to keep America the strongest country in the world ..... 2) to destroy those individuals and organizations that seek nuclear weapons so as to kill as many innocent people as possible, and 3) remain the world’s policeman. These aims cannot be achieved if America aims to disarm”.

### ***The Latest on P-BOB’s Appointments***

I just can’t stay away from this topic! So, I will continue with updates on our President’s appointments until I become totally bored, or have no material. Bored is most likely.

Back at Ron Sims as the President’s nominee for the #2 post at HUD – I’m hearing more complaints about him since I mentioned his name here a few weeks ago. His nomination hearing may be soon after the Easter recess. This is a truly “disingenuous” selection, so states Michelle Malkin. The White House describes him as a “visionary urban leader”. She places this in the context of P-BOB’s express pledge for a new level of “transparency” in government. He got into trouble by refusing to obey public disclosure rules he was subject to. This had to do with local election information and other requests for public information which he was accused of stonewalling. And in January 2009, BEFORE he was nominated, the high court in Washington State issued a strong ruling which damned Sims “blatant violations of the state Public Records Act”. The State Supreme court remanded the case back to the lower courts to determine a final fine that may exceed some \$1 million in taxpayer funds. Long live transparency.

The Associated Press reports that Lawrence Summers, P-BOB’s top economic adviser, earned millions over the past year as managing director of the hedge fund E.E. Shaw Group (\$5.2 million) and through speaking engagements (at least \$1 million). I personally have no real

problems with this pick, but considering the tone of the President's rhetoric in the campaign, the choice seems inconsistent. This inconsistency seems most apparent when considering the strict rules he enacted against hiring lobbyists for administration positions that would have influence over their former clients.

For what it's worth, top White House aide and senior advisor David Axelrod disclosed that he sold his share of two campaign and media strategy businesses last year for \$3 million. Additionally he earned more than \$1 million from his consulting businesses. I wonder how much came from public election funds and from the Democratic party. HMMMMMM?

Former Yale Law School Dean Harold Koh has been nominated as legal adviser for the State Department. In the past Koh has frequently stated his views that the U.S. is often the "bad guy". He views himself as a "transnationalist" – as contrasted to Supreme Court justices Roberts, Scalia, and Alito who are nationalists. He looks to U.S.'s interdependence with the rest of the world in developing his legal philosophy. For example, he is reported to have said that in an appropriate case he doesn't see any reason why sharia (Muslim) law would not be applied to govern a case in the United States. That's a tad frightening!

President Obama originally picked Thomas Saenz to head the civil rights division at the Justice Department. Later he decided to go in another direction because of Saenz's efforts on behalf of illegal immigrants which would have made him too much of a target. Tom Perez, currently Maryland's secretary of labor, is the new choice. He has baggage but don't we all.

P-BOb represents hope, change, motherhood and apple pie to many – i.e. nothing radical or controversial. Consider his nominee to head the Office of Legal Counsel, Dawn Johnsen. Johnsen is the former legal director of the National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League. While there she said that restrictions on abortion were "involuntary servitude". With government restrictions on them, "the state has conscripted (an expectant mother's) body for its own ends" leading to "forced pregnancy". This she says is a violation of the 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment, which outlawed slavery. She declared that pregnancy "requires a woman to provide continuous physical service to the fetus in order to further the state's asserted interest". There's more but that's enough for now. If P-BOb aims to de-politicize the Justice Department, as he claims, by selecting Johnsen he has, in the words of Kathryn Lopez, "picked an ideologue who would absolutely do just the opposite".

One more "lack of payment of past taxes" example is the nominee to be head of Health and Human Services, Kathleen Sebelius. Serious or not, I thought I should mention it. It's almost routine with government officials these days – she's just one of many!

Until next time .....

---

More comments will follow on important topics and personal thoughts as our President battles through tough territory. As I said in my December 2008 "essay" on liberals and conservatives, "I want to be on record joining with other conservatives in uniting behind our new President. We must show that we will act more respectfully than liberals did during George W. Bush's

presidency. Such treatment was beyond mere disagreement and criticism. It was undeserved and unprecedented. We who oppose many of Barack Obama's policies will, I believe, act in accordance with conservative values of decency, while respectfully continuing to oppose him when we disagree". As Dennis Prager said on election night: "I did not vote for him. I did not want him to be President. But as of January 20, 2009, he will be my President." I agree, and I'm also solidly part of the "loyal opposition", and will act accordingly.

---

*I extend thanks, as always, to the many writers, commentators, researchers, and others, from both political extremes, whose hard work helps me greatly. They gather details and individually present so much information. About all I do is gather, organize, summarize, and then attempt to fill in with additional comments – commonly referred to as my frequent "RANTS". Someone recently commented to me that it's no wonder I have these ideas – I obviously don't pay attention to both sides of the arguments. I assure you that I approach issues from multiple angles. While I have become a conservative, I still read and evaluate more liberal columns, books, commentary, and web sites than Al Franken, Al Gore, Jesse Jackson, Al Sharpton, Chuck Schumer, Nancy Pelosi, and Harry Reid COMBINED! Maybe I could even throw in a couple more names for good measure.*