

## **P-BOB's PRECIOUS PRIZE**

**– (Ain't He Exceptionally Equivalent? – Or Is It Equivalently Exceptional?)**

**Stephen L. Bakke – October 19, 2009**

(Please review the **GLOSSARY of GOVSPEAK** near the end of this report.)

---

In December of 2008, I wrote a report analyzing something that really intrigues me – the contrasts between liberal and conservative thought, and some of their motivations. Because I wrote the report in 2008, I made no connection to the Nobel Peace Prize. Little did I know that in only a few short weeks, and just twelve days into his Presidency, P-BOB would be quietly nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize. Also, little did I know that I had already answered the questions I would immediately ask ..... “Why?! And How?!”

First, here are some direct quotes from my report.

### ***Re: Good Intentions Trump Results***

“Historical reliance on the mantra ‘the proof is in the pudding’ has given way to a philosophy that purity of motive is what matters, not results. What matters most is having good intentions. To liberals, goodness and good intentions are the important thing.”

### ***Re: World Citizenship and Multiculturalism***

“A patriotic American identity has started to be replaced by a ‘world citizen’ identity ..... Multiculturalism is believed by some to have contributed to this change.”

“Since the 1960s, conservatives would contend, a major goal of the Left has been to weaken American national identity and replace it with other cultural, national, racial and ethnic identities. Many on the Left feel that no culture is inherently superior to another, just different.”

“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.’”

### ***Re: Embracing One World Government – The United Nations***

“Many on the Left embrace the idea that the United Nations and other multinational organizations are imbued with a moral authority not found in ‘nation-states’ like ours. Senator John Kerry, during his campaign for the presidency, described American foreign and defense policy as only being legitimate when it passed a ‘global test’ – in other words, approval by the international community.”

“Many on the Left would regard world opinion, e.g. the U.N., as a better arbiter of what is good than is America. On the other hand the Right has a low opinion of the U.N.’s moral compass and of world opinion. Most on the Right would consider the U.N. as having a much poorer record of stopping genocide and other evils than America has.”

***Re: Moral Equivalence***

“Liberals accuse conservatives of being too judgmental about other countries, cultures, and individuals. Conservatives observe that there has been a dramatic increase in criticism of the U.S. and a similar increase in quiet tolerance for other countries with which we have serious political and moral differences ..... For example, the late, eminent, liberal historian Arthur Schlesinger, was asked if America was, all things considered, more moral than the Soviet society. He said America is not. Another example is a 2006 interview with Howard Zinn – professor emeritus of political science at Boston University ..... In the interview, he was asked if America has done more good for humanity than bad. His reply: ‘probably more bad than good.’”

***Re: 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. Some contend that the Left prefers Europe’s quasi-pacifism, cradle-to-grave socialism, egalitarianism, and secularism. The Right would ..... point out that the U.S. leads the world in too many areas for us to start imitating those who are trailing behind ..... There was an interesting quote in a recent Harvard Magazine: ‘Americans, on average, have a higher tolerance for income inequality than their European counterparts. American attitudes focus on equality of opportunity, while Europeans tend to see fairness in equal outcomes.’”

***Re: 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.”

***Re: National Defense***

“Anti-war values have replaced a view of nationalism and national security.”

“Theirs (the Left) is a world where there are attractive, win-win ‘solutions’ in place of those ugly trade-offs in the world. Theirs is a world where we can just talk to opposing nations and work things out, instead of having to pour tons of money into military equipment to keep them at bay ..... The Left has been criticized for attaching too much importance to being loved.”

“International negotiations, in the eye of a liberal, are most successful if conducted between two equals. Conservatives would try to negotiate from a position of strength.”

“Many liberals would . . . . . believe in strength through peace, and believe they can better influence the behavior of enemies by demonstrating our good intentions.”

***Re: A World Without Nuclear Weapons***

“The Left wants a world, and therefore an America, devoid of nuclear weapons. The Right wants America to have the best nuclear weapons. The Right trusts American might more than universal disarmament. Liberals believe a world without nuclear weapons is achievable. Conservatives believe that since the technology exists, evil men and nations will obtain and use them. Therefore the Right does not believe in the Left’s goal of America and its enemies having the same weapons. They argue that the ‘enemy’ certainly won’t let this happen.”

***OK, So What?***

While I have separated the above into individual sections, I always have great trouble separating these concepts. I can’t talk about rejecting “American Exceptionalism” without it leading into comments on “European Vision” or “World Citizenship” or the “United Nations”, etc. If we really think about it, the answers for my questions of “Why! and How! could P-POB be nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize – let alone actually receive it? The answer was all there right in the report I had already written.

Who better to help me explain this than the Norwegian (UFF DA!) committee that made the selection. Here is the entire announcement of the selection by the committee. My “interrupting” comments follows each quote and are shown in ***bold italics***) **Remember that P-BOB’s nomination occurred only 12 days into his administration and the award was announced less than nine months later.**

- “The Norwegian Nobel Committee has decided that the Nobel Peace Prize for 2009 is to be awarded to President Barack Obama for his extraordinary efforts to strengthen international diplomacy and cooperation between peoples.”

***EXTRAORDINARY EFFORTS?! GOOD GRIEF CHARLIE BROWN! Refer back to the section on “Good Intentions Trump Results.” Remember that it is the motives and intentions that are important to liberals – not results or accomplishments. It’s the most natural thing in the world for the leftist awards committee to consider P-BOB’s intentions as adequate –even without results.***

- “The Committee has attached special importance to Obama’s vision of and work for a world without nuclear weapons.”

*Refer to the earlier section on “A World Without Nuclear Weapons”. Such a vision is idyllic – but it’s merely a vision. With all of the “bad guys” in the world, it’ll never happen – they won’t let nuclear weapons disappear!*

- “Obama has as President created a new climate in international politics. Multinational diplomacy has regained a central position, with emphasis on the role that the United Nations and other international institutions can play.”

*Refer back to the section “Embracing One World Government – The United Nations” and “World Citizenship and Multiculturalism.” Liberals often suggest that American foreign and defense policy is legitimate only after passing a ‘global test’ – in other words, approval by the international community.*

- “Dialogue and negotiations are preferred as instruments for resolving even the most difficult international conflicts.”

*Refer to the above section on “National Defense.” Remember that for liberals, international negotiations are most successful if conducted between two equals. (THAT’S MY TEETH YOU HEAR GRINDING!)*

- “The vision of a world free from nuclear arms has powerfully stimulated disarmament and arms control negotiations.”

*Refer again to the section “A World Without Nuclear Weapons.” I can’t give credence to the naïve theory that if we unilaterally disarm to equalize our weapons capability with others in the world, that the “bad guys” will actually let equality happen. I confidently believe that if technology exists, evil men and nations will obtain and use them.*

- “Thanks to Obama’s initiative, the USA is now playing a more constructive role in meeting the great climatic challenges the world is confronting.”

*This assertion cuts across all of the earlier sections whereby the committee and P’BOB want to equalize the status and economic standing of all countries. After all, there is no culture which can be considered superior to another – just different. There is nothing that will effectively drag the U.S. down closer to the rest of the world than the Crap and Tax legislation being pushed by P-BOB.*

- “Democracy and human rights are to be strengthened.”

*I have to refer to Denis Prager to address this phrase. He has done a similar analysis to what I am doing here – similar format, different commentary. He states, “This has no meaning; it is nonsense. Under Barack Obama, the United States has not been the friend of democrats around the world. America has responded weakly to the democratic movement in Iran ..... pressured*

*democratic Israel, made overtures to Hugo Chavez while denying American ally and pro-democratic Colombia a free trade agreement, abandoned Honduran anti-Chavez democrats, and has obsequiously deferred to Vladimir Putin.” (And, may I add, he has had the U.S. re-join the corrupt and embarrassingly hypocritical United Nations Human Rights Council.)*

- “Only very rarely has a person to the same extent as Obama captured the world’s attention and given its people hope for a better future.”

*This is pandering to P-BOB’s huge ego to “keep on keepin’ on” in the direction he’s going. Nowhere else does he get this kind of adoration these days.*

- “His diplomacy is founded in the concept that those who are to lead the world must do so on the basis of values and attitudes that are shared by the majority of the world’s population.”

*Talk about undermining American exceptionalism! As I wrote earlier, a patriotic American identity has started to be replaced by a “world citizen” identity and 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.”*

Did I pull my analysis and opinions out of a hat? Here are some quotes from others, representing both sides of the political fence:

- From the chairman of the Nobel Peace Prize Committee: “We hope this can contribute a little bit to enhance what he is **trying** to do.” (Emphasis added.)
  - Liberal columnist Clarence Page wrote: “So, congratulations on your prize, Mr. President. I hope you can earn it now .....
  - “The award is a symbolic statement of opposition to American exceptionalism, American might, American Capitalism, American self-determination, and American pursuit of America’s interests in the world.” – columnist Andy McCarthy.
  - Even P-BOB weighed in and emphasized his lack of accomplishment, the committee’s goal of endorsing a view consistent with their own, and the transnational/world citizen concept: “Maybe I better do something now .....
- Throughout history, the Nobel Peace Prize has not just been used to honor specific achievement, it’s also been used as a means to give momentum to a set of causes, and that’s why I will accept this award as a call to action – a call for all nations to confront the common challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.”

- Columnist and commentator Robert Tracinski commented as follows: This Nobel Prize is meant “not to reward something Obama has done, but to influence his future action.” (Note that P-BOB agrees.)
- “The Nobel Committee chose him wisely because he does, in fact, represent the organization’s highest ideals. He is an American president queasy about the projection of American power. He is an American president who rejects the notion of American exceptionalism. He is an American president eagerly in pursuit of legitimacy to be granted him not by those who voted for him but by those who do not cast a vote and who chafe at American leadership. It is his devout wish that America become one of many nations, influencing the world indirectly or not influencing it at all, rather than “the indispensable nation,” as Madeleine Albright characterized it. He is the encapsulation, the representative, the wish fulfillment, the very embodiment, of the multilateralist impulse. He is, almost literally, a dream come true for the sorts of people who treasure and value the Nobel Peace Prize. – (Heavy talk!) – that from columnist John Pdhoretz.
- Finally, from columnist, commentator, and editor, Rich Lowry: “Commentators have noted the ‘aspirational’ nature of Obama’s prize. What ..... is the aspiration? The same as with the Annan, Carter, and ElBaradei prizes: to tame America, to encourage it to accommodate its enemies, to make it a ‘normal’ nation occupying a humble place in the multilateral tapestry of the world.”

---

So, in the final analysis, P-BOB was selected because his vision is admired by typical transnational, socialist, European politicians. He is in tune with the Nobel Peace Prize committee – which is a group of leftist, Norwegian parliamentarians. He has the prize because he’s a full fledged transnational liberal and the committee wants to encourage him to “keep up the good work!” P-BOB, it seems to me, is rejecting the longstanding, well deserved, concept of **American exceptionalism**. He doesn’t want the United States to pursue its longstanding, while certainly imperfect, essential leadership position. I think I had it “nailed”. **And it saddens me!**

**Someone bring me an oxygen bottle and a gurney! And please call my dentist!**

---

## **GLOSSARY of GOVSPEAK (Language of our Government)**

*P-BOB* – President **Barack Obama**  
*MESSIAH* – Another name for P-BOB  
*POTUS* – President **O**f **T**he United States  
*POTUS(-I)* – Same as W  
*SILLY* – Short for former POTUS “**Slick Willy**”  
*THE ONE* – One more name for P-BOB  
*W* – Former POTUS, George **W.** Bush

Da’ Prez

*A’DEM* – Democrat or **A DEM**ocrat  
*A’REP* – Republican or **A REP**ublican

Da’ Rest

*A'GOTUS* – **A**ttorney **G**eneral **O**f **T**he **U**nited **S**tates (say: “a goat t’us)  
*BIPPY* – That place that many in **STYMI**ED sometimes put their brain containers  
*CHA-FED* – **CHA**irman of the **FED**eral Reserve  
*COS-E* – **C**hief **O**f **S**taff (Rahm) **E**manuel (pronounced “cozy”)  
*COTUS* – **C**ongress **O**f **T**he **U**nited **S**tates  
*DA'DEMS* – **D**emocrats  
*DA'REPS* - **R**epublicans  
*DA'VEEP* – **V**ice **P**resident **J**oe **B**iden  
*DA'VEEP(-1)* – **P**rior **V**ice **P**resident **D**ick **C**heney  
*DA'VEEP(-2)* – **A**l **G**ore  
*DO-P-OTUS* – **D**aughters **O**f **T**he **P**resident **O**f **T**he **U**nited **S**tates (say: “dopy Otis”)  
*FA-FLITTER* – **P**-**B**ob ‘flits’/prances like **F**red **A**staire(**FA**)(separated at birth?)(say: fay-flitter)  
*FIDO-TUS* – **F**irst **D**Og of **T**he **U**nited **S**tates – **FF**OTUS’s pet (say: “fido t’us”)  
*FFOTUS* – **F**irst **F**amily **O**f **T**he **U**nited **S**tates (pronounced with an opening “flutter”)  
*FLOTUS* – **F**irst **L**ady **O**f **T**he **U**nited **S**tates  
*GITMO* – That place that **P**-**B**ob just don’t ‘git’  
*HE-SING'N* – **D**escribes **P**-**B**ob’s “head swiveling” while at the **T**OTUS (pronounced “he singin”)  
*HORTUS* – **H**ouse **O**f **R**epresentatives of **T**he **U**nited **S**tates (pronounced “whore t’us”)  
*HUGS* – **C**onveys **P**-**B**ob’s **H**UGE **S**mile  
*J-SECOTUS* – **J**oint **S**ession of **C**ongress **O**f **T**he **U**nited **S**tates (say: jay secotus)  
*J-STRAPS* – **A**nother name for **P**-**B**ob’s “supporters” (you know how to pronounce it)  
*KSM* – **K**halid **S**heikh **M**ohammed – the senior terrorist enjoying time at **G**ITMO (say: “kiss ’im)  
*FL-M-Ob* – **F**irst **L**ady **M**ichelle **O**Bama (pronounced just like it’s spelled)  
*MAJHORTUS* – **H**ORTUS **MA**Jority **L**eaders, **M**aryland’s **S**teny **H**oyer  
*MALSOTUS* – **T**he dynamic **S**OTUS **MA**ority **L**eaders, **N**evada’s **H**arry **R**eid (seniority got him the job)  
*MILHORTUS* – **H**ORTUS **MI**nority **L**eaders, **O**hio’s **J**ohn **B**oehner  
*MILSOTUS* – **S**OTUS **MI**nority **L**eaders, **K**entucky’s **M**itch **M**c**C**onnell (also must have relied on seniority)  
*PATOTUS* – **P**-**B**ob’s **P**osition **A**t the **T**elep**ro**mp**ter** **O**f **T**he **U**nited **S**tates  
*PEP* – **P**recipitous **E**nvironmental **P**rograms (pronounced “pep”)  
*PORK* – **R**efers to any absurdly expensive aspect of **P**-**B**ob’s **O**verdone **R**ecovery **K**it (spend on everything)  
*P-PPPPP* – **P**-**B**ob’s **P**enchant for **P**ushing **P**recipitous and **P**eculiar **P**rograms (say: “pee pep”)  
*PRESOTUS* – **P**REsident of **S**OTUS – **S**ame as **DA**’**VEEP**  
*SCOTUS* – **S**upreme **C**ourt **O**f the **U**nited **S**tates  
*SECS* – **S**ECretary of **S**tate (would that be **H**illary?) (pronounced “sex”)  
*SHORTUS* – **T**he (**L**oud) **S**peaker of **H**ORTUS, **N**ancy **P**  
*SOTUS* – **S**enate **O**f **T**he **U**nited **S**tates  
*STYMIED – **S**Table of the ‘**Y**’ncredibly **M**isinform**ED** (all of **P**-**B**ob’s “folks”)  
*TOTUS* – **T**elep**ro**mp**ter** **O**f **T**he **U**nited **S**tates  
*T-SEC* – **T**reasury **S**ECretary what’s his name  
*T-SEC(+1)* – **W**hoever replaces the **T**-**S**EC  
*T-SEC(-1)* – **T**he former **T**-**S**EC  
*WB* – **P**opularly known as “**W**ater**B**oarding” – the technique **P**-**B**ob just don’t ‘git’  
*WH* – **P**-**B**ob’s current residence (the **W**hite **H**ouse)*

---

I extend thanks, as always, to the many writers, commentators, researchers, and others, from all political extremes, whose hard work helps me greatly. They gather details and present much information. About all I do is gather, organize, summarize, and attempt to fill in with comments – commonly referred to as my frequent “**RANTS**”.

More comments will follow on important topics and personal thoughts as our President battles through tough territory. I want to join other conservatives in recognizing and respecting our new President – and supporting him when we should. But when we oppose our President’s policies, we should act in accordance with values of decency – but that doesn’t preclude a healthy dose of sarcasm and satire, which are valuable tools for political commentary.