

 **TODAY'S "SHORT TOPIC"**
IN BLIND
DEFENSE OF
OBAMA



By Stephen L. Bakke  February 9, 2015

Here's what provoked me:

Syndicated columnist E.J. Dionne recently came to the defense of Obama's mention of Christian atrocities during the Crusades. The President made a comparison between the Crusades almost 1,000 years ago, and the brutality being carried out by radical Islamic terrorists today. If you go back and view the comments, Obama is clearly making a nuanced and painfully tortured attempt at establishing moral equivalency between Christians and modern Islamic terrorism. He's making a huge mistake by trivializing the growing Islamic terrorism.

Here's my response:

In Blind Defense of Obama

E.J. Dionne came to the defense of Obama's mention of Christian atrocities during the Crusades ("Makes little sense to attack Obama over faith thoughts" – February 9). The President made a comparison between the Crusades of almost 1,000 years ago, and the brutality being carried out by radical Islamic terrorists today.

Dionne's points:

- Critics apparently don't want a president to have complicated religious views.
- Christians should acknowledge their imperfections and express contrition and humility in this setting.
- We shouldn't use this event to celebrate ourselves.
- We should cancel the National Prayer Breakfast if a president can't do this type of soul searching.

Mr. Dionne should know the President's purpose did not fit those noble parameters. Rather:

- This was a nuanced and painfully tortured attempt at establishing moral equivalency between Christians and radical Islamic terrorism.
- This was meant to defend Obama's assertion that the growing Islamic terrorism is not an existential threat to the U.S.
- He had to reach back 1,000 years because he couldn't come up with an adequate current comparison.
- He's trivializing terrorism to be consistent with his refusal to aggressively deal with it.

Dionne is wrong to defend these actions.