

EXCEPTIONAL GROVELING BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Stephen L. Bakke – December 19, 2010

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 “spooky” how the liberal thinking of our President is so predictable. His world travels and use of his teleprompter (TP) sent ripples/waves of concern through many in the “loyal opposition”. I hear he brought twelve TPs along with him on one trip. 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 Obama steps up to the TP. 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 – a Look Back.

At the G-20 meeting in London some time ago, 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 Obama 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 our President, but his groveling most certainly was more than exceptional. ***Remember when 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”. Remember, while in France, he 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.

Last year, while in Ankara, Turkey, 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 Obama’s first official acts was to grant an interview to Al Arabiya, the Arabic language network that broadcasts worldwide. Just like in Europe, 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 our President made a big mistake by clearly putting down his predecessor while on official trips overseas. (Bush would never have done such a tacky thing to his predecessor - seriously!) But there he was, early in his presidency, blaming the Muslim/American “bad blood” on Bush. Characterizing Bush in this way has been described as clear libel. After 9/11, Bush 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 arguably 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.

Reflect on the current debate over the proposed START Treaty with Russia. I previously gave my somewhat unpopular opinion on that issue. Then think back to the President’s 2009 visit to Prague which gave him an extra chance to 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”. Last year he threw U.S. allies, Poland and the Czech Republic, under the bus as part of his “reset” efforts with Russia. He stopped certain missile defense efforts important to those countries because of Russian opposition. And here we go with START.

Apparently Obama naively 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, he reminded the world 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 Obama, 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.* Obama’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? While I endorse some of the goals and direction of START, it remains a fact that our President is sincerely and sadly naïve is.

One of my favorites, Dennis Prager, put 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.”*

More discussions on American Exceptionalism (and those who try to deny it) will follow.